



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 31, 2007

No. 124

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNERNEY).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 31, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JERRY McNERNEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) for 4 minutes.

### REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE ETHICS REFORM

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, many members of the freshman class were elected in part because people were tired of the culture of corruption that they saw here in Washington and the total lack of accountability for those that broke the law and betrayed the American trust. People out in America look at Washington and they just don't understand how

Members of Congress over the past several years could be carted off to Federal prisons while their own body, the Congress of the United States, sat by and did virtually nothing to hold these people accountable for their actions.

Today, Congress will pass landmark lobbying reform legislation. Fund-raising will become more transparent, sunlight will be shed on lobbyist influence, the K Street Project will end, and the revolving door for Members of Congress will shut a little bit tighter. But as Congress reduces the influence of people outside the body of Congress, we also need to recommit ourselves to cleaning up our own House by reforming the House ethics process. We will all celebrate our victory today. It will be a critical step to changing how things work in Washington. But we can't stop here. We need to make our ethics process work again by establishing a new citizen ethics panel independent of Congress with the power to initiate and vet ethics enforcement actions. We need this reform not because Members of Congress are corrupt but because they are the victims of simple human nature. It isn't natural to turn against your colleagues, your coworkers and your confidants to file complaints against each other under our current ethics process. Inaction within our current system isn't corruption, it's just human instinct. That's why responsible ethics reform will allow an independent panel to initiate these complaints, guaranteeing that friendships and work relationships don't get in the way of enforcing our ethics rules.

Mr. Speaker, soon after I was elected last November, I went to speak at an elementary school in my hometown of Cheshire. At the end of my talk, a fifth grader stood up and asked me a question. He said, Mr. MURPHY, you sound good now, but how do I know that you're not going to go down to Washington and become like everybody else?

I laughed a little bit when he asked me that question, but it's frankly a good one. And the danger for all of us is that the longer that someone spends here, the more ownership you take over the very system that you once ran against. And even though you may know that the system is broken, sometimes it just seems far too long a bridge to cross in order to fix it. But it has to be fixed. And it may just fall upon the newest Members of this body to do the mending. Because it's not just happenstance that some of the strongest voices for this reform are the freshman class, those who have spent the least amount of time working under this dome. Maybe because we just spent the last 2 years spending 18 hours a day living and breathing the frustrations of people outside the Beltway, even those that aren't old enough to vote, that we see with clear eyes what I think everyone inside the Beltway knows in their heart—that our current ethics process doesn't work and it feeds the perception that politicians spend far too much time and too much effort watching their own backs.

Listen, I know reform isn't easy, especially when it comes to setting up the rules by which we enforce our own code of conduct. This is delicate stuff. And I understand the fear that some Members have of handing over our ethics process to some outside independent body. But we need to rise above these fears, not only because we owe it to ourselves to remove the built-in conflicts of interest that put Members between a rock and a hard place but because the people out there in the Fifth District of Connecticut and every other district in America won't believe in their Congress again until they know that we can police ourselves.

Reform isn't easy. Not the landmark lobbying bill that we will pass today or the needed ethics reforms still to come. But, Mr. Speaker, nothing worthwhile ever is.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9055

## ETHICS REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE) is recognized during morning-hour debate for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask support for the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007. I hail from Ohio's 18th Congressional District, a district of proud, hard-working people who understand the virtues of personal responsibility, a district whose constituency was betrayed in years past by a Member of this body who crossed a line. My predecessor is now in prison and he has been imprisoned for having, once again, betrayed his constituents and sold his vote. He became mired in and then consumed by a scandal involving lobbyists. This legislation helps further break the link that exists between lobbyists, legislators and the wealthy clients that lobbyists represent. It represents yet another positive step forward. It's not the end. It represents more of the beginning of a process whereby bribery will become deinstitutionalized from this body. It represents a process whereby we can make decisions in this body on an informed, rational basis designed specifically to benefit the good people who put us here.

Early on in this Congress, we banned trips and gifts and meals from lobbyists, a good first step. Now we are bringing transparency to the system. But it can't stop here. My colleague from Connecticut raises the prospect of an independent organization to review potential breaches of law, something that I associate myself with, but we need yet to go beyond even that with aggressive and comprehensive campaign finance reform. I support this measure because I think it represents a good first step along that process, but again I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to taking it yet farther, and that is again with the deinstitutionalization of bribery through comprehensive campaign finance reform.

## IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized during morning-hour debate for 2 minutes.

Mr. SESTAK. I am here to speak about Iraq. Americans are tired of this war, but at the same time they want to secure the best of the situation for the perception of security not just in that region but globally.

I watch the Republicans and our concern as Democrats is that they believe that our military might provide a solution in Iraq. I look at my party and my concern is that we need to stop the impure opposition and to begin to help craft, to help author an implementable, comprehensive Middle East/Persian

Gulf security plan. But to do that, we obviously need a union with our Republican brethren.

I honestly believe that when people talk about taking care of our troops, the belief is not that we use them in war when necessary but where and how we use them. There are the elements right now to begin to come together in a union to craft a comprehensive end to this tragic misadventure that can meet the goals of both sides.

First, we have an army that is strained and by next April we will be at the point of almost irreparable harm for some years to come. Second, we know that in order to redeploy that army out of Iraq, it will take time. When the Soviet Union left Afghanistan with 120,000 troops, it took them 9 months and because of the ill preparation, 500 died on the way. We have 160,000 troops, 100,000 contractors. We must work well to get them to redeploy safely. They can only take in Kuwait two to two and a half brigades at a time. Forty combat equivalent brigades are in Iraq. The math comes out to a minimum of 18 to 24 months.

Third, because of that time line we can use the last arrow in our arsenal we have not used, diplomacy. The road out of Iraq is through Tehran, Iran. If we have the ability as we slowly redeploy to bring together Iran to work for stability, we can have a comprehensive solution to this conflict.

## VISITING FOOD AND FRIENDS, A D.C.-BASED ANTI-HUNGER ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized during morning-hour debate for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of spending a morning at Food and Friends, an organization that provides high-nutrient meals and nutrition therapy for people living with life-threatening illnesses, like HIV/AIDS, cancer and diabetes. It's located right here in Washington, DC. Five of my esteemed colleagues joined me on this visit, Representatives JO ANN EMERSON, LOIS CAPPAS, JAN SCHAKOWSKY, BARBARA LEE, and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. Our visit was enlightening and inspiring.

Food and Friends began in 1988 when Reverend Carla Gorrell began making lunch for her friend who was so sick with AIDS that she was unable to leave the house. Reverend Gorrell recognized what is so basic, and yet so often overlooked. When we treat people with diseases, she recognized that nutritious food is an essential component of any medical regimen. Today, almost 20 years later, Food and Friends remains steadfast in its mission to provide high-nutrient meals, with care and compassion, to the critically ill in Washington, DC, Maryland and Virginia. Since 1988, Food and Friends has

delivered more than 10 million meals to nearly 16,000 individuals. The organization that began in a church basement now operates in a multifaceted facility with over 50 staff members and, most impressively, 1,500 dedicated volunteers.

While my colleagues and I were at Food and Friends, we learned a tremendous amount about the significance of nutritious food for those suffering from critical illnesses. Laura Otolski, one of the three full-time dietitians on staff, educated us about the importance of individually treating each client's nutritional needs. To this end, the dietitians assess clients and then collaborate with chefs to prepare 14 different meal plans, including pureed meals for individuals who cannot chew solid food and meals for the homeless who may not have access to refrigerators and ovens.

Food and Friends staff members also recognize that to treat an individual, you must also provide food for his or her children and caretakers. For example, if a mother is too sick to cook and a volunteer only delivers a meal for her, she will give it to her children and go without food. Therefore, Food and Friends delivers meals for the whole family, including a specially designed children's meal plan. For those who live beyond Food and Friends' delivery area, they are eligible for the Groceries to Go service that provides two bags of nonperishable groceries as well as perishable frozen meals prepared by Food and Friends kitchen staff. In addition to providing food, Food and Friends offers cooking classes, nutritional counseling and even a photography workshop for clients to express themselves through art. Through its diverse programs, Food and Friends nourishes the body as well as the mind and soul.

Without a doubt, the highlight of our visit was hearing from two Food and Friends clients, Ajani Johnson and Crystal Wood. They described the hopelessness they felt when first learning about their illnesses. How quickly he felt sick. How far her cancer had spread. But then they told us about the gift of food that changed the course of their lives. The food—and the friendship of staff and volunteers that accompanied it—renewed their physical strength and belief in their ability to fight the disease. They became passionate when talking about the power of food to improve their quality of life while battling deadly illnesses. They also wanted us to know that they're not just clients of Food and Friends, they are also volunteers of the organization. They want others to experience the nourishment and compassion that was freely offered to them.

Mr. Speaker, Food and Friends is not alone in serving meals to the sick in this country. It is part of a national and international network of 120 agencies collectively serving 10 million meals to individuals each year. The Association of Nutrition Services Agencies is currently working with the Congressional Hunger Center on a Food as

Medicine initiative. The purpose of the Food as Medicine campaign is to educate local and national leaders, academics and citizens about the value of nutrition services for those fighting disease.

We have the information we need to make great strides in recognizing the therapeutic effects of nutrition for those living with life-threatening illnesses, and I urge my colleagues to work together to ensure that all critically ill Americans have access to food and nutrition therapy as part of their treatment plans. These services improve the efficacy of medications and the quality of life of those suffering and their families. It is a simple but crucial step in improving the quality of health care in this country.

#### ACCOUNTABILITY IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) is recognized during morning-hour debate for 3 minutes.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of accountability in Congress. This year, taxpayers will pay the retirement benefits for Dan Rostenkowski, Duke Cunningham and Bob Ney. What do these men have in common? All are retired Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. All are convicted criminals. Each abused his office by committing fraud, bribery or conspiracy, and each was found guilty in Federal court.

Despite their convictions, these three representatives and over a dozen other former lawmakers remain eligible to draw taxpayer-funded pensions for their service. The exact amount of the payments vary, of course, but the average is about \$47,000 per year. That's more than the average American makes. Let me tell you, it's certainly more than the average Kansan makes. Certainly a lot more than the average person in the Second District of Kansas makes.

Mr. Speaker, when the new majority was sworn into the House of Representatives, we had a clear mandate from Americans—End the scandals. Clean up Congress. We've already taken meaningful first steps toward reform. In our first days, we passed an ethics package that banned Members from accepting gifts from lobbyists. We blocked representatives from flying on corporate jets. And we prevented Congressmen from pressuring businesspeople to fire or hire for political reasons.

That last one to me is especially important. Before this Congress, our Congressmen were out there actually influencing people and saying, if you don't agree with my politics, we're asking you to hire or fire businesspeople. It was so wrong.

But our work is not done and it never will be done as long as convicted criminals can draw a congressional pension. Congress can and should revoke the

pensions of convicted lawmakers. But for decades now, even as payments have totaled millions of dollars, this body has quietly ignored the problem. But no longer. Today, the bill we will consider this afternoon incorporates legislation that I authored to strip the pensions of these crooked lawmakers. The final bill also sets limits on the so-called revolving door of lawmakers who are turning into lobbyists, and it imposes financial disclosure requirements on the lobbying industry. Sunlight is the best disinfectant and we need a whole lot more transparency still.

Taken together, these changes represent the most significant ethics overhaul to pass the Congress in decades. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. By enacting these sweeping reforms, Congress can begin to recover from the long years of scandal and corruption. Congress can begin to earn back Americans' trust.

#### ETHICS REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) is recognized during morning-hour debate for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, when I was campaigning last year for this seat in Congress, we talked about a lot of issues. We talked about Iraq. We talked about global warming. But we also talked about a very important issue on ethics. Ethics in Congress. It is disappointing to me that people in Indiana and around the country don't have a lot of respect for Members of Congress. I think our approval rating right now is at 23 percent. And one of the reasons why the approval rate is at 23 percent is because we're not doing a very good job in Congress in investigating the wrongdoings of a few Members.

And I want to emphasize it's just a few Members. Because most Members in this August body are honorable people. But there are a few that are spoiling the basket. We need to do a better job of policing the Congress of the United States. And so one of the things that I have done and one of the campaign promises that I want to keep that I made during the campaign last year is making sure that we clean up our act in Congress. One of the ways that we do that is changing the way we govern ourselves here in Congress. Right now in Congress, the Ethics Committee has a hard time with investigating Members of Congress because they are our colleagues. It's kind of like investigating members of your own family. It's hard to do. It's just natural that Members of Congress are reluctant to investigate the wrongdoings of their own Members. And so I think we need a change. We need to have an independent body of members who are investigating the minor wrongdoings of Members of Congress. And so I propose and have intro-

duced legislation that would set up a new committee of Congress, of former Members of Congress who know this institution, who respect this institution, who will do the investigations that need to be done about a few Members of Congress who are misbehaving.

This new body would have subpoena powers. They would have all the powers that the present Ethics Committee has to them now, but they would be independent. And that's what we need. We need an independent committee that would investigate the wrongdoings of a few Members of Congress. We need to make this bipartisan. We need to restore the respect and honor of this Congress. A 23 percent approval rating is not acceptable and we need to do a better job. I believe that having former Members of Congress on a committee to investigate the wrongdoings of a few, and I emphasize a few Members of Congress, is the way to go. We need to make progress on this. We need to do this. We're going into the August recess. I hope that when we come back after the August recess that we will actually implement and pass into law an independent body of former Members of Congress to investigate those people who are doing what they should not be doing and that we can get about the business of restoring the integrity of Congress. I think it's very important.

I've been in politics for 20 years. It's an honor for me to serve in this body, and to think that only 23 percent of the people have faith and confidence in the Congress is not acceptable. I believe that setting up an independent committee of former Members of Congress can help at least restore some of the integrity that we have lost in Congress.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10 a.m.

#### PRAYER

The Reverend Richard D. Turpin, Second Baptist Church, Catskill, New York, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, Creator and everlasting Redeemer, we come asking Your Holy presence to be with us today. We are filled with great joy that You allowed us to gather here this morning. We thank You for being our protector of lasting nights lying down and the guidance of this morning's sunrise.

Father, we ask Your Holy Spirit to bless the work of this day and bless the

governing body of this House to be on one accord in spirit and in truth. So every plan, every proposal, every decision would be orchestrated by Your presence.

Lord, I ask You to be kind and graceful, and place a hedge of love and patience around the families in the homes of these, Your leaders, while they're doing the assigned work of our Nation.

Father, we ask Your peace where there is war, love where there is anger, and joy where there is sorrow. And we place it now in Your hands and trust it to be so.

And we pray this prayer in the name that is above all names, Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING THE REVEREND RICHARD D. TURPIN

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Reverend Richard David Turpin, who has so eloquently provided the blessing to open the House this day.

Reverend Turpin serves as the pastor of the Second Baptist Church in beautiful Catskill, New York, just across the Hudson River from my home in New York's 20th Congressional Dis-

trict. And I welcome his beautiful family, who has joined us in the gallery.

The Reverend is a native of New York's capital region and has been an influential force in the Catskill community since he assumed his current position in the Second Baptist Church in 2000.

As preacher and counselor for the prison ministry at Albany Correctional Facility, chaplain for the Albany Rescue Mission, president of the Hudson River Frontier Missionary Baptist Association Laymen Ministry, and athletic coordinator for the Youth Department of the Empire Missionary Baptist Convention, Reverend Turpin has touched the lives of young and old throughout upstate New York.

I thank him for his service to our district, for his dedication to his faith, and for taking the time to travel with his family from Clifton Park to address the House of Representatives today.

#### LOBBYING REFORM

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, last year, we promised to break the link between lobbyists and legislators here in Washington and to fundamentally change the culture of corruption that has become accepted practice here. This new law is on the doorstep of becoming law.

Today, we will pass this bill that fixes an institutional problem with an institutional solution. Our bill mandates unprecedented disclosure of lobbying activities and turns the spotlight on special interests who have grown too comfortable with their special access.

Most importantly, our legislation levels the playing field between the special interests and the voters. When the gavel comes down on the Speaker's podium, it is intended to open the people's House, not the auction house.

The American people, and not paid lobbyists on behalf of the special interests, should have access to their government 365 days a year. Election day should not just be a formality.

Now the Senate must do its work and pass this legislation. Americans have waited long enough for this Congress to pass real lobbying reform. It is time to turn this bill into law and give the American people a government as good as its people.

#### 100 YEARS OF SCOUTING

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th year of the Boy Scouts. On August 1, 1907, Robert Baden-Powell, along with 20 young men, opened a camp at Brownsea Island, England. Since that day, Scouting has been responsible for inspiring

more than 300 million individuals from over 216 countries and territories. The role and mission behind Scouting is to create an education program that promotes common ideals such as loyalty and honor.

Scouting has achieved success with dedicated adult volunteers who encourage young people to be constructive citizens. As the grateful father of four Eagle Scouts, encouraged by my wife, Roxanne, I have seen firsthand the positive influence of Scouting.

Four years ago today, I participated in my second backpacking trek at Philmont Scout Ranch in New Mexico. I wish the Boy Scouts a happy 100th birthday and congratulate them on their 21st World Scout Jamboree.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1495, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. OBERSTAR submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1495) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 110-280)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1495), to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Development Act of 2007".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

Sec. 2. *Definition of Secretary.*

##### TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 1001. *Project authorizations.*

Sec. 1002. *Small projects for flood damage reduction.*

Sec. 1003. *Small projects for emergency streambank protection.*

Sec. 1004. *Small projects for navigation.*

Sec. 1005. *Small projects for improvement of the quality of the environment.*

Sec. 1006. *Small projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration.*

Sec. 1007. *Small projects for shoreline protection.*

Sec. 1008. *Small projects for snagging and sediment removal.*

Sec. 1009. *Small projects to prevent or mitigate damage caused by navigation projects.*

Sec. 1010. *Small projects for aquatic plant control.*



## TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Non-Federal contributions.  
 Sec. 2002. Funding to process permits.  
 Sec. 2003. Written agreement for water resources projects.  
 Sec. 2004. Compilation of laws.  
 Sec. 2005. Dredged material disposal.  
 Sec. 2006. Remote and subsistence harbors.  
 Sec. 2007. Use of other Federal funds.  
 Sec. 2008. Revision of project partnership agreement; cost sharing.  
 Sec. 2009. Expedited actions for emergency flood damage reduction.  
 Sec. 2010. Watershed and river basin assessments.  
 Sec. 2011. Tribal partnership program.  
 Sec. 2012. Wildfire firefighting.  
 Sec. 2013. Technical assistance.  
 Sec. 2014. Lakes program.  
 Sec. 2015. Cooperative agreements.  
 Sec. 2016. Training funds.  
 Sec. 2017. Access to water resource data.  
 Sec. 2018. Shore protection projects.  
 Sec. 2019. Ability to pay.  
 Sec. 2020. Aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration.  
 Sec. 2021. Small flood damage reduction projects.  
 Sec. 2022. Small river and harbor improvement projects.  
 Sec. 2023. Protection of highways, bridge approaches, public works, and non-profit public services.  
 Sec. 2024. Modification of projects for improvement of the quality of the environment.  
 Sec. 2025. Remediation of abandoned mine sites.  
 Sec. 2026. Leasing authority.  
 Sec. 2027. Fiscal transparency report.  
 Sec. 2028. Support of Army civil works program.  
 Sec. 2029. Sense of Congress on criteria for operation and maintenance of harbor dredging projects.  
 Sec. 2030. Interagency and international support authority.  
 Sec. 2031. Water resources principles and guidelines.  
 Sec. 2032. Water resource priorities report.  
 Sec. 2033. Planning.  
 Sec. 2034. Independent peer review.  
 Sec. 2035. Safety assurance review.  
 Sec. 2036. Mitigation for fish and wildlife and wetlands losses.  
 Sec. 2037. Regional sediment management.  
 Sec. 2038. National shoreline erosion control development program.  
 Sec. 2039. Monitoring ecosystem restoration.  
 Sec. 2040. Electronic submission of permit applications.  
 Sec. 2041. Project administration.  
 Sec. 2042. Program administration.  
 Sec. 2043. Studies and reports for water resources projects.  
 Sec. 2044. Coordination and scheduling of Federal, State, and local actions.  
 Sec. 2045. Project streamlining.  
 Sec. 2046. Project deauthorization.  
 Sec. 2047. Federal hopper dredges.

## TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 3001. Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama.  
 Sec. 3002. Cook Inlet, Alaska.  
 Sec. 3003. King Cove Harbor, Alaska.  
 Sec. 3004. Seward Harbor, Alaska.  
 Sec. 3005. Sitka, Alaska.  
 Sec. 3006. Tatitlek, Alaska.  
 Sec. 3007. Rio De Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona.  
 Sec. 3008. Nogales Wash and tributaries flood control project, Arizona.  
 Sec. 3009. Tucson drainage area, Arizona.  
 Sec. 3010. Osceola Harbor, Arkansas.  
 Sec. 3011. St. Francis River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.  
 Sec. 3012. Pine Mountain Dam, Arkansas.  
 Sec. 3013. Red-Ouachita River Basin Levees, Arkansas and Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3014. Cache Creek Basin, California.

Sec. 3015. CALFED stability program, California.  
 Sec. 3016. Compton Creek, California.  
 Sec. 3017. Grayson Creek/Murderer's Creek, California.  
 Sec. 3018. Hamilton Airfield, California.  
 Sec. 3019. John F. Baldwin Ship Channel and Stockton Ship Channel, California.  
 Sec. 3020. Kaweah River, California.  
 Sec. 3021. Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California.  
 Sec. 3022. Llagas Creek, California.  
 Sec. 3023. Maggie Creek, California.  
 Sec. 3024. Pacific Flyway Center, Sacramento, California.  
 Sec. 3025. Petaluma River, Petaluma, California.  
 Sec. 3026. Pinole Creek, California.  
 Sec. 3027. Prado Dam, California.  
 Sec. 3028. Redwood City Navigation Channel, California.  
 Sec. 3029. Sacramento and American Rivers flood control, California.  
 Sec. 3030. Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, California.  
 Sec. 3031. Sacramento River bank protection, California.  
 Sec. 3032. Salton Sea restoration, California.  
 Sec. 3033. Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.  
 Sec. 3034. Santa Barbara Streams, Lower Mission Creek, California.  
 Sec. 3035. Santa Cruz Harbor, California.  
 Sec. 3036. Seven Oaks Dam, California.  
 Sec. 3037. Upper Guadalupe River, California.  
 Sec. 3038. Walnut Creek Channel, California.  
 Sec. 3039. Wildcat/San Pablo Creek Phase I, California.  
 Sec. 3040. Wildcat/San Pablo Creek Phase II, California.  
 Sec. 3041. Yuba River Basin project, California.  
 Sec. 3042. South Platte River basin, Colorado.  
 Sec. 3043. Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland.  
 Sec. 3044. St. George's Bridge, Delaware.  
 Sec. 3045. Brevard County, Florida.  
 Sec. 3046. Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida.  
 Sec. 3047. Canaveral Harbor, Florida.  
 Sec. 3048. Gasparilla and Estero Islands, Florida.  
 Sec. 3049. Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida.  
 Sec. 3050. Peanut Island, Florida.  
 Sec. 3051. Port Sutton, Florida.  
 Sec. 3052. Tampa Harbor-Big Bend Channel, Florida.  
 Sec. 3053. Tampa Harbor Cut B, Florida.  
 Sec. 3054. Allatoona Lake, Georgia.  
 Sec. 3055. Latham River, Glynn County, Georgia.  
 Sec. 3056. Dworshak Reservoir improvements, Idaho.  
 Sec. 3057. Little Wood River, Gooding, Idaho.  
 Sec. 3058. Beardstown Community Boat Harbor, Beardstown, Illinois.  
 Sec. 3059. Cache River Levee, Illinois.  
 Sec. 3060. Chicago River, Illinois.  
 Sec. 3061. Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois.  
 Sec. 3062. Emiquon, Illinois.  
 Sec. 3063. Lasalle, Illinois.  
 Sec. 3064. Spunky Bottoms, Illinois.  
 Sec. 3065. Cedar Lake, Indiana.  
 Sec. 3066. Koontz Lake, Indiana.  
 Sec. 3067. White River, Indiana.  
 Sec. 3068. Des Moines River and Greenbelt, Iowa.  
 Sec. 3069. Perry Creek, Iowa.  
 Sec. 3070. Rathbun Lake, Iowa.  
 Sec. 3071. Hickman Bluff stabilization, Kentucky.  
 Sec. 3072. Mcalpine Lock and Dam, Kentucky and Indiana.  
 Sec. 3073. Prestonsburg, Kentucky.  
 Sec. 3074. Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed.

Sec. 3075. Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3076. Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, regional visitor center, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3077. Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3078. Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3079. Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3080. Red River (J. Bennett Johnston) Waterway, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3081. Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3082. Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet relocation assistance, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3083. Violet, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3084. West bank of the Mississippi River (East of Harvey Canal), Louisiana.  
 Sec. 3085. Camp Ellis, Saco, Maine.  
 Sec. 3086. Cumberland, Maryland.  
 Sec. 3087. Poplar Island, Maryland.  
 Sec. 3088. Detroit River shoreline, Detroit, Michigan.  
 Sec. 3089. St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, Michigan.  
 Sec. 3090. St. Joseph Harbor, Michigan.  
 Sec. 3091. Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan.  
 Sec. 3092. Ada, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3093. Duluth Harbor, McQuade Road, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3094. Grand Marais, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3095. Grand Portage Harbor, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3096. Granite Falls, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3097. Knife River Harbor, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3098. Red Lake River, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3099. Silver Bay, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3100. Taconite Harbor, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3101. Two Harbors, Minnesota.  
 Sec. 3102. Deer Island, Harrison County, Mississippi.  
 Sec. 3103. Jackson County, Mississippi.  
 Sec. 3104. Pearl River Basin, Mississippi.  
 Sec. 3105. Festus and Crystal City, Missouri.  
 Sec. 3106. L-15 levee, Missouri.  
 Sec. 3107. Monarch-Chesterfield, Missouri.  
 Sec. 3108. River Des Peres, Missouri.  
 Sec. 3109. Lower Yellowstone project, Montana.  
 Sec. 3110. Yellowstone River and tributaries, Montana and North Dakota.  
 Sec. 3111. Antelope Creek, Lincoln, Nebraska.  
 Sec. 3112. Sand Creek watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska.  
 Sec. 3113. Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska.  
 Sec. 3114. Lower Truckee River, McCarran Ranch, Nevada.  
 Sec. 3115. Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey.  
 Sec. 3116. Passaic River basin flood management, New Jersey.  
 Sec. 3117. Cooperative agreements, New Mexico.  
 Sec. 3118. Middle Rio Grande restoration, New Mexico.  
 Sec. 3119. Buffalo Harbor, New York.  
 Sec. 3120. Long Island Sound oyster restoration, New York and Connecticut.  
 Sec. 3121. Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers watershed management, New York.  
 Sec. 3122. Orchard Beach, Bronx, New York.  
 Sec. 3123. Port of New York and New Jersey, New York and New Jersey.  
 Sec. 3124. New York State Canal System.  
 Sec. 3125. Susquehanna River and Upper Delaware River watershed management, New York.  
 Sec. 3126. Missouri River restoration, North Dakota.  
 Sec. 3127. Wahpeton, North Dakota.  
 Sec. 3128. Ohio.  
 Sec. 3129. Lower Girard Lake Dam, Girard, Ohio.  
 Sec. 3130. Mahoning River, Ohio.  
 Sec. 3131. Arcadia Lake, Oklahoma.  
 Sec. 3132. Arkansas River Corridor, Oklahoma.  
 Sec. 3133. Lake Eufaula, Oklahoma.  
 Sec. 3134. Oklahoma lakes demonstration program, Oklahoma.

- Sec. 3135. Ottawa County, Oklahoma.  
 Sec. 3136. Red River chloride control, Oklahoma and Texas.  
 Sec. 3137. Waurika Lake, Oklahoma.  
 Sec. 3138. Upper Willamette River watershed ecosystem restoration, Oregon.  
 Sec. 3139. Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.  
 Sec. 3140. Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 3141. Sheraden Park Stream and Chartiers Creek, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 3142. Solomon's Creek, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 3143. South Central Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 3144. Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 3145. Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island.  
 Sec. 3146. Missouri River Restoration, South Dakota.  
 Sec. 3147. Cedar Bayou, Texas.  
 Sec. 3148. Freeport Harbor, Texas.  
 Sec. 3149. Lake Kemp, Texas.  
 Sec. 3150. Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas.  
 Sec. 3151. North Padre Island, Corpus Christi Bay, Texas.  
 Sec. 3152. Pat Mayse Lake, Texas.  
 Sec. 3153. Proctor Lake, Texas.  
 Sec. 3154. San Antonio Channel, San Antonio, Texas.  
 Sec. 3155. Connecticut River restoration, Vermont.  
 Sec. 3156. Dam remediation, Vermont.  
 Sec. 3157. Lake Champlain Eurasian milfoil, water chestnut, and other non-native plant control, Vermont.  
 Sec. 3158. Upper Connecticut River Basin wetland restoration, Vermont and New Hampshire.  
 Sec. 3159. Upper Connecticut River basin ecosystem restoration, Vermont and New Hampshire.  
 Sec. 3160. Lake Champlain watershed, Vermont and New York.  
 Sec. 3161. Sandbridge Beach, Virginia Beach, Virginia.  
 Sec. 3162. Tangier Island Seawall, Virginia.  
 Sec. 3163. Duwamish/Green, Washington.  
 Sec. 3164. McNary Lock and Dam, McNary National Wildlife Refuge, Washington and Idaho.  
 Sec. 3165. Snake River project, Washington and Idaho.  
 Sec. 3166. Yakima River, Port of Sunnyside, Washington.  
 Sec. 3167. Bluestone Lake, Ohio River Basin, West Virginia.  
 Sec. 3168. Greenbrier River basin, West Virginia.  
 Sec. 3169. Lesage/Greenbottom Swamp, West Virginia.  
 Sec. 3170. Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia.  
 Sec. 3171. McDowell County, West Virginia.  
 Sec. 3172. Parkersburg, West Virginia.  
 Sec. 3173. Green Bay Harbor, Green Bay, Wisconsin.  
 Sec. 3174. Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin.  
 Sec. 3175. Mississippi River headwaters reservoirs.  
 Sec. 3176. Upper basin of Missouri River.  
 Sec. 3177. Upper Mississippi River System environmental management program.  
 Sec. 3178. Upper Ohio River and Tributaries navigation system new technology pilot program.  
 Sec. 3179. Continuation of project authorizations.  
 Sec. 3180. Project reauthorizations.  
 Sec. 3181. Project deauthorizations.  
 Sec. 3182. Land conveyances.  
 Sec. 3183. Extinguishment of reversionary interests and use restrictions.
- TITLE IV—STUDIES**
- Sec. 4001. John Glenn Great Lakes Basin Program.  
 Sec. 4002. Lake Erie dredged material disposal sites.  
 Sec. 4003. Southwestern United States drought study.  
 Sec. 4004. Delaware River.  
 Sec. 4005. Eurasian milfoil.  
 Sec. 4006. Fire Island, Alaska.  
 Sec. 4007. Knik Arm, Cook Inlet, Alaska.  
 Sec. 4008. Kuskokwim River, Alaska.  
 Sec. 4009. Nome Harbor, Alaska.  
 Sec. 4010. St. George Harbor, Alaska.  
 Sec. 4011. Susitna River, Alaska.  
 Sec. 4012. Valdez, Alaska.  
 Sec. 4013. Gila Bend, Maricopa, Arizona.  
 Sec. 4014. Searcy County, Arkansas.  
 Sec. 4015. Aliso Creek, California.  
 Sec. 4016. Fresno, Kings, and Kern counties, California.  
 Sec. 4017. Fruitvale Avenue Railroad Bridge, Alameda, California.  
 Sec. 4018. Los Angeles River revitalization study, California.  
 Sec. 4019. Lytle Creek, Rialto, California.  
 Sec. 4020. Mokelumne River, San Joaquin County, California.  
 Sec. 4021. Orick, California.  
 Sec. 4022. Shoreline study, Oceanside, California.  
 Sec. 4023. Rialto, Fontana, and Colton, California.  
 Sec. 4024. Sacramento River, California.  
 Sec. 4025. San Diego County, California.  
 Sec. 4026. San Francisco Bay, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California.  
 Sec. 4027. South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, California.  
 Sec. 4028. Twentynine Palms, California.  
 Sec. 4029. Yucca Valley, California.  
 Sec. 4030. Selenium studies, Colorado.  
 Sec. 4031. Delaware and Christina Rivers and Shellpot Creek, Wilmington, Delaware.  
 Sec. 4032. Delaware inland bays and tributaries and Atlantic coast, Delaware.  
 Sec. 4033. Collier County Beaches, Florida.  
 Sec. 4034. Lower St. Johns River, Florida.  
 Sec. 4035. Herbert Hoover Dike supplemental major rehabilitation report, Florida.  
 Sec. 4036. Vanderbilt Beach Lagoon, Florida.  
 Sec. 4037. Meriwether County, Georgia.  
 Sec. 4038. Boise River, Idaho.  
 Sec. 4039. Ballard's Island Side Channel, Illinois.  
 Sec. 4040. Chicago, Illinois.  
 Sec. 4041. Salem, Indiana.  
 Sec. 4042. Buckhorn Lake, Kentucky.  
 Sec. 4043. Dewey Lake, Kentucky.  
 Sec. 4044. Louisville, Kentucky.  
 Sec. 4045. Vidalia Port, Louisiana.  
 Sec. 4046. Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts and Rhode Island.  
 Sec. 4047. Clinton River, Michigan.  
 Sec. 4048. Hamburg and Green Oak Townships, Michigan.  
 Sec. 4049. Lake Erie at Luna Pier, Michigan.  
 Sec. 4050. Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin.  
 Sec. 4051. Northeast Mississippi.  
 Sec. 4052. Dredged material disposal, New Jersey.  
 Sec. 4053. Bayonne, New Jersey.  
 Sec. 4054. Carteret, New Jersey.  
 Sec. 4055. Gloucester County, New Jersey.  
 Sec. 4056. Perth Amboy, New Jersey.  
 Sec. 4057. Batavia, New York.  
 Sec. 4058. Big Sister Creek, Evans, New York.  
 Sec. 4059. Finger Lakes, New York.  
 Sec. 4060. Lake Erie Shoreline, Buffalo, New York.  
 Sec. 4061. Newtown Creek, New York.  
 Sec. 4062. Niagara River, New York.  
 Sec. 4063. Shore Parkway Greenway, Brooklyn, New York.  
 Sec. 4064. Upper Delaware River watershed, New York.  
 Sec. 4065. Lincoln County, North Carolina.  
 Sec. 4066. Wilkes County, North Carolina.  
 Sec. 4067. Yadkinville, North Carolina.  
 Sec. 4068. Flood damage reduction, Ohio.  
 Sec. 4069. Lake Erie, Ohio.  
 Sec. 4070. Ohio River, Ohio.  
 Sec. 4071. Toledo Harbor dredged material placement, Toledo, Ohio.  
 Sec. 4072. Toledo Harbor, Maumee River, and Lake Channel project, Toledo, Ohio.  
 Sec. 4073. Ecosystem restoration and fish passage improvements, Oregon.  
 Sec. 4074. Walla Walla River basin, Oregon.  
 Sec. 4075. Chartiers Creek watershed, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 4076. Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 4077. Western Pennsylvania flood damage reduction.  
 Sec. 4078. Williamsport, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 4079. Yardley Borough, Pennsylvania.  
 Sec. 4080. Rio Valenciano, Juncos, Puerto Rico.  
 Sec. 4081. Woonsocket local protection project, Blackstone River basin, Rhode Island.  
 Sec. 4082. Crooked Creek, Bennettsville, South Carolina.  
 Sec. 4083. Broad River, York County, South Carolina.  
 Sec. 4084. Savannah River, South Carolina and Georgia.  
 Sec. 4085. Chattanooga, Tennessee.  
 Sec. 4086. Cleveland, Tennessee.  
 Sec. 4087. Cumberland River, Nashville, Tennessee.  
 Sec. 4088. Lewis, Lawrence, and Wayne Counties, Tennessee.  
 Sec. 4089. Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek, Memphis, Tennessee.  
 Sec. 4090. Abilene, Texas.  
 Sec. 4091. Coastal Texas ecosystem protection and restoration, Texas.  
 Sec. 4092. Port of Galveston, Texas.  
 Sec. 4093. Grand County and Moab, Utah.  
 Sec. 4094. Southwestern Utah.  
 Sec. 4095. Ecosystem and hydropower generation dams, Vermont.  
 Sec. 4096. Elliott Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington.  
 Sec. 4097. Monongahela River Basin, Northern West Virginia.  
 Sec. 4098. Kenosha Harbor, Wisconsin.  
 Sec. 4099. Johnsonville Dam, Johnsonville, Wisconsin.  
 Sec. 4100. Wauwatosa, Wisconsin.  
 Sec. 4101. Debris removal.
- TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS**
- Sec. 5001. Maintenance of navigation channels.  
 Sec. 5002. Watershed management.  
 Sec. 5003. Dam safety.  
 Sec. 5004. Structural integrity evaluations.  
 Sec. 5005. Flood mitigation priority areas.  
 Sec. 5006. Additional assistance for authorized projects.  
 Sec. 5007. Expedited completion of reports and construction for certain projects.  
 Sec. 5008. Expedited completion of reports for certain projects.  
 Sec. 5009. Southeastern water resources assessment.  
 Sec. 5010. Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers enhancement project.  
 Sec. 5011. Great Lakes fishery and ecosystem restoration program.  
 Sec. 5012. Great Lakes remedial action plans and sediment remediation.  
 Sec. 5013. Great Lakes tributary models.  
 Sec. 5014. Great Lakes navigation and protection.  
 Sec. 5015. Saint Lawrence Seaway.  
 Sec. 5016. Upper Mississippi River dispersal barrier project.  
 Sec. 5017. Estuary restoration.  
 Sec. 5018. Missouri River and tributaries, mitigation, recovery, and restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.  
 Sec. 5019. Susquehanna, Delaware, and Potomac River basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

- Sec. 5020. Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
- Sec. 5021. Chesapeake Bay oyster restoration, Virginia and Maryland.
- Sec. 5022. Hypoxia assessment.
- Sec. 5023. Potomac River watershed assessment and tributary strategy evaluation and monitoring program.
- Sec. 5024. Lock and dam security.
- Sec. 5025. Research and development program for Columbia and Snake River salmon survival.
- Sec. 5026. Wage surveys.
- Sec. 5027. Rehabilitation.
- Sec. 5028. Auburn, Alabama.
- Sec. 5029. Pinhook Creek, Huntsville, Alabama.
- Sec. 5030. Alaska.
- Sec. 5031. Barrow, Alaska.
- Sec. 5032. Lowell Creek Tunnel, Seward, Alaska.
- Sec. 5033. St. Herman and St. Paul Harbors, Kodiak, Alaska.
- Sec. 5034. Tanana River, Alaska.
- Sec. 5035. Wrangell Harbor, Alaska.
- Sec. 5036. Augusta and Clarendon, Arkansas.
- Sec. 5037. Des Arc levee protection, Arkansas.
- Sec. 5038. Loomis Landing, Arkansas.
- Sec. 5039. California.
- Sec. 5040. Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and tributaries, Stockton, California.
- Sec. 5041. Cambria, California.
- Sec. 5042. Contra Costa Canal, Oakley and Knightsen, California; Mallard Slough, Pittsburg, California.
- Sec. 5043. Dana Point Harbor, California.
- Sec. 5044. East San Joaquin County, California.
- Sec. 5045. Eastern Santa Clara basin, California.
- Sec. 5046. LA-3 dredged material ocean disposal site designation, California.
- Sec. 5047. Lancaster, California.
- Sec. 5048. Los Osos, California.
- Sec. 5049. Pine Flat Dam fish and wildlife habitat, California.
- Sec. 5050. Raymond Basin, Six Basins, Chino Basin, and San Gabriel Basin, California.
- Sec. 5051. San Francisco, California.
- Sec. 5052. San Francisco, California, waterfront area.
- Sec. 5053. San Pablo Bay, California, watershed and Suisun Marsh ecosystem restoration.
- Sec. 5054. St. Helena, California.
- Sec. 5055. Upper Calaveras River, Stockton, California.
- Sec. 5056. Rio Grande environmental management program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.
- Sec. 5057. Charles Hervey Townshend Breakwater, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut.
- Sec. 5058. Stamford, Connecticut.
- Sec. 5059. Delmarva conservation corridor, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.
- Sec. 5060. Anacostia River, District of Columbia and Maryland.
- Sec. 5061. East Central and Northeast Florida.
- Sec. 5062. Florida Keys water quality improvements.
- Sec. 5063. Lake Worth, Florida.
- Sec. 5064. Big Creek, Georgia, watershed management and restoration program.
- Sec. 5065. Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District.
- Sec. 5066. Savannah, Georgia.
- Sec. 5067. Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming.
- Sec. 5068. Riley Creek Recreation Area, Idaho.
- Sec. 5069. Floodplain mapping, Little Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois.
- Sec. 5070. Reconstruction of Illinois and Missouri flood protection projects.
- Sec. 5071. Illinois River basin restoration.
- Sec. 5072. Promontory Point third-party review, Chicago shoreline, Chicago, Illinois.
- Sec. 5073. Kaskaskia River basin, Illinois, restoration.
- Sec. 5074. Southwest Illinois.
- Sec. 5075. Calumet region, Indiana.
- Sec. 5076. Floodplain mapping, Missouri River, Iowa.
- Sec. 5077. Paducah, Kentucky.
- Sec. 5078. Southern and eastern Kentucky.
- Sec. 5079. Winchester, Kentucky.
- Sec. 5080. Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- Sec. 5081. Calcasieu Ship Channel, Louisiana.
- Sec. 5082. East Atchafalaya basin and Amite River basin region, Louisiana.
- Sec. 5083. Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock project, Louisiana.
- Sec. 5084. Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.
- Sec. 5085. Southeast Louisiana region, Louisiana.
- Sec. 5086. West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana.
- Sec. 5087. Charlestown, Maryland.
- Sec. 5088. St. Mary's River, Maryland.
- Sec. 5089. Massachusetts dredged material disposal sites.
- Sec. 5090. Ontonagon Harbor, Michigan.
- Sec. 5091. Crookston, Minnesota.
- Sec. 5092. Garrison and Kathio Township, Minnesota.
- Sec. 5093. Itasca County, Minnesota.
- Sec. 5094. Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Sec. 5095. Northeastern Minnesota.
- Sec. 5096. Wild Rice River, Minnesota.
- Sec. 5097. Mississippi.
- Sec. 5098. Harrison, Hancock, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi.
- Sec. 5099. Mississippi River, Missouri and Illinois.
- Sec. 5100. St. Louis, Missouri.
- Sec. 5101. St. Louis Regional Greenways, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Sec. 5102. Missoula, Montana.
- Sec. 5103. St. Mary project, Glacier County, Montana.
- Sec. 5104. Lower Platte River watershed restoration, Nebraska.
- Sec. 5105. Hackensack Meadowlands area, New Jersey.
- Sec. 5106. Atlantic Coast of New York.
- Sec. 5107. College Point, New York City, New York.
- Sec. 5108. Flushing Bay and Creek, New York City, New York.
- Sec. 5109. Hudson River, New York.
- Sec. 5110. Mount Morris Dam, New York.
- Sec. 5111. North Hempstead and Glen Cove North Shore watershed restoration, New York.
- Sec. 5112. Rochester, New York.
- Sec. 5113. North Carolina.
- Sec. 5114. Stanly County, North Carolina.
- Sec. 5115. John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, North Carolina.
- Sec. 5116. Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Sec. 5117. Ohio River basin environmental management.
- Sec. 5118. Toussaint River navigation project, Carroll Township, Ohio.
- Sec. 5119. Statewide comprehensive water planning, Oklahoma.
- Sec. 5120. Fern Ridge Dam, Oregon.
- Sec. 5121. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 5122. Clinton County, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 5123. Kehly Run Dams, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 5124. Lehigh River, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 5125. Northeast Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 5126. Upper Susquehanna River basin, Pennsylvania and New York.
- Sec. 5127. Cano Martin Pena, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- Sec. 5128. Lakes Marion and Moultrie, South Carolina.
- Sec. 5129. Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration, South Dakota.
- Sec. 5130. East Tennessee.
- Sec. 5131. Fritz Landing, Tennessee.
- Sec. 5132. J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir, Tennessee.
- Sec. 5133. Nashville, Tennessee.
- Sec. 5134. Nonconnah Weir, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Sec. 5135. Tennessee River partnership.
- Sec. 5136. Town Creek, Lenoir City, Tennessee.
- Sec. 5137. Upper Mississippi embayment, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi.
- Sec. 5138. Texas.
- Sec. 5139. Bosque River watershed, Texas.
- Sec. 5140. Dallas County region, Texas.
- Sec. 5141. Dallas Floodway, Dallas, Texas.
- Sec. 5142. Harris County, Texas.
- Sec. 5143. Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas.
- Sec. 5144. Onion Creek, Texas.
- Sec. 5145. Connecticut River dams, Vermont.
- Sec. 5146. Lake Champlain Canal, Vermont and New York.
- Sec. 5147. Dyke Marsh, Fairfax County, Virginia.
- Sec. 5148. Eastern Shore and Southwest Virginia.
- Sec. 5149. James River, Virginia.
- Sec. 5150. Baker Bay and Ilwaco Harbor, Washington.
- Sec. 5151. Hamilton Island campground, Washington.
- Sec. 5152. Erosion control, Puget Island, Wahkiakum County, Washington.
- Sec. 5153. Willapa Bay, Washington.
- Sec. 5154. West Virginia and Pennsylvania flood control.
- Sec. 5155. Central West Virginia.
- Sec. 5156. Southern West Virginia.
- Sec. 5157. Construction of flood control projects by non-Federal interests.
- Sec. 5158. Additional assistance for critical projects.
- TITLE VI—FLORIDA EVERGLADES**
- Sec. 6001. Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida.
- Sec. 6002. Pilot projects.
- Sec. 6003. Maximum costs.
- Sec. 6004. Credit.
- Sec. 6005. Outreach and assistance.
- Sec. 6006. Critical restoration projects.
- Sec. 6007. Regional engineering model for environmental restoration.
- TITLE VII—LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA**
- Sec. 7001. Definitions.
- Sec. 7002. Comprehensive plan.
- Sec. 7003. Louisiana coastal area.
- Sec. 7004. Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force.
- Sec. 7005. Project modifications.
- Sec. 7006. Construction.
- Sec. 7007. Non-Federal cost share.
- Sec. 7008. Project justification.
- Sec. 7009. Independent review.
- Sec. 7010. Expedited reports.
- Sec. 7011. Reporting.
- Sec. 7012. New Orleans and vicinity.
- Sec. 7013. Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet.
- Sec. 7014. Hurricane and storm damage reduction.
- Sec. 7015. Larose to Golden Meadow.
- Sec. 7016. Lower Jefferson Parish, Louisiana.
- TITLE VIII—UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATER-WAY SYSTEM**
- Sec. 8001. Definitions.
- Sec. 8002. Navigation improvements and restoration.
- Sec. 8003. Authorization of construction of navigation improvements.
- Sec. 8004. Ecosystem restoration authorization.
- Sec. 8005. Comparable progress.
- TITLE IX—NATIONAL LEVEE SAFETY PROGRAM**
- Sec. 9001. Short title.
- Sec. 9002. Definitions.
- Sec. 9003. Committee on Levee Safety.
- Sec. 9004. Inventory and inspection of levees.
- Sec. 9005. Limitations on statutory construction.
- Sec. 9006. Authorization of appropriations.
- SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.**
- In this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Army.

**TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS****SEC. 1001. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.**

Except as otherwise provided in this section, the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this section:

(1) **HAINES, ALASKA.**—The project for navigation, Haines, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 20, 2004, at a total cost of \$14,040,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,232,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,808,000.

(2) **PORT LIONS, ALASKA.**—The project for navigation, Port Lions, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 14, 2006, at a total cost of \$9,530,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$7,624,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,906,000.

(3) **SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, ARIZONA.**—The project for environmental restoration, Santa Cruz River, Pima County, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 28, 2006, at a total cost of \$97,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$63,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$34,400,000.

(4) **TANQUE VERDE CREEK, PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA.**—The project for environmental restoration, Tanque Verde Creek, Pima County, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 2003, at a total cost of \$5,906,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$3,836,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,070,000.

(5) **SALT RIVER (RIO SALADO OESTE), MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA.**—The project for environmental restoration, Salt River (Rio Salado Oeste), Maricopa County, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 19, 2006, at a total cost of \$166,650,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$106,629,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$60,021,000.

(6) **SALT RIVER (VA SHLY'AY AKIMEL), MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for environmental restoration, Salt River (Va Shly'ay Akimel), Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 3, 2005, at a total cost of \$162,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$105,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$56,900,000.

(B) **COORDINATION WITH FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS.**—The Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall coordinate the design and construction of the project described in subparagraph (A) with the Bureau of Reclamation and any operating agent for any Federal reclamation project in the Salt River Basin to avoid impacts to existing Federal reclamation facilities and operations in the Salt River Basin.

(7) **MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, ARKANSAS.**—The project for flood damage reduction, May Branch, Fort Smith, Arkansas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 19, 2006, at a total cost of \$30,850,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$15,010,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$15,840,000.

(8) **HAMILTON CITY, GLENN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**—The project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Hamilton City, Glenn County, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 22, 2004, at a total cost of \$52,400,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$34,100,000 and estimated non-Federal cost of \$18,300,000.

(9) **SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, IMPERIAL BEACH, CALIFORNIA.**—The project for storm damage reduction, Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 30, 2003, at a total cost of \$13,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,521,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,179,000, and at an estimated total cost of \$42,500,000 for periodic beach nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated

Federal cost of \$21,250,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$21,250,000.

(10) **MATILILJA DAM, VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**—The project for environmental restoration, Matililja Dam, Ventura County, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 20, 2004, at a total cost of \$144,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$89,700,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$54,800,000.

(11) **MIDDLE CREEK, LAKE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**—The project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Middle Creek, Lake County, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated November 29, 2004, at a total cost of \$45,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$29,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$15,700,000.

(12) **NAPA RIVER SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for environmental restoration, Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, Napa, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 22, 2004, at a total cost of \$134,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$87,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$47,000,000.

(B) **ADMINISTRATION.**—In carrying out the project authorized by this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

(i) construct a recycled water pipeline extending from the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District Waste Water Treatment Plant and the Napa Sanitation District Waste Water Treatment Plant to the project; and

(ii) restore or enhance Salt Ponds 1, 1A, 2, and 3.

(13) **DENVER COUNTY REACH, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, DENVER, COLORADO.**—The project for environmental restoration, Denver County Reach, South Platte River, Denver, Colorado: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 16, 2003, at a total cost of \$20,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$13,065,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,035,000.

(14) **CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, INDIAN RIVER LAGOON, FLORIDA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out the project for ecosystem restoration, water supply, flood control, and protection of water quality, Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon, Florida, at a total cost of \$1,365,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$682,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$682,500,000, in accordance with section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680) and the recommendations of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 6, 2004.

(B) **DEAUTHORIZATIONS.**—The following projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(i) The uncompleted portions of the project for the C-44 Basin Storage Reservoir of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, authorized by section 601(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2682), at a total cost of \$147,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$73,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$73,900,000.

(ii) The uncompleted portions of the Martin County, Florida, modifications to the project for Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 740), at a total cost of \$15,471,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,073,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,398,000.

(iii) The uncompleted portions of the East Coast Backpumping, St. Lucie—Martin County, Spillway Structure S-311 modifications to the project for Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 740), at a total cost of \$77,118,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$55,124,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$21,994,000.

(15) **COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, PICAYUNE STRAND RESTORATION PROJECT, COL-**

**LIER COUNTY, FLORIDA.**—The project for ecosystem restoration, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Picayune Strand Restoration Project, Collier County, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 15, 2005, at a total cost of \$375,330,000 with an estimated Federal cost of \$187,665,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$187,665,000.

(16) **COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, SITE 1 IMPOUNDMENT PROJECT, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.**—The project for ecosystem restoration, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Site 1 Impoundment Project, Palm Beach County, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 19, 2006, at a total cost of \$80,840,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$40,420,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$40,420,000.

(17) **MIAMI HARBOR, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for navigation, Miami Harbor, Miami-Dade County, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 25, 2005, at a total cost of \$125,270,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$75,140,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$50,130,000.

(B) **GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of the general reevaluation report that resulted in the report of the Chief of Engineers referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be the same percentage as the non-Federal share of cost of construction of the project.

(C) **AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary shall enter into a new partnership with the non-Federal interest to reflect the cost sharing required by subparagraph (B).

(18) **EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY, ILLINOIS.**—The project for environmental restoration and recreation, East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 22, 2004, at a total cost of \$208,260,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$134,910,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$73,350,000.

(19) **PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, ILLINOIS.**—The project for environmental restoration, Peoria Riverfront Development, Illinois: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 28, 2003, at a total cost of \$18,220,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,840,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,380,000.

(20) **WOOD RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION, MADISON COUNTY, ILLINOIS.**—The project for flood damage reduction, Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 18, 2006, at a total cost of \$17,220,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,193,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,027,000.

(21) **DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, DES MOINES, IOWA.**—The project for flood damage reduction, Des Moines and Racoon Rivers, Des Moines, Iowa: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 28, 2006, at a total cost of \$10,780,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$6,967,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,813,000.

(22) **LICKING RIVER BASIN, CYNTHIANA, KENTUCKY.**—The project for flood damage reduction, Licking River Basin, Cynthiana, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 24, 2006, at a total cost of \$18,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,830,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,370,000.

(23) **BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LOUISIANA.**—The project for navigation, Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 3, 2005, at a total cost of \$9,600,000. The costs of construction of the project are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(24) **MORGANZA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LOUISIANA.**—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 23, 2002, and July 22, 2003, at a total cost of \$886,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$576,355,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$310,345,000.

(B) *OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.*—The operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of the Houma Navigation Canal lock complex and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway floodgate features of the project described in subparagraph (A) that provide for inland waterway transportation shall be a Federal responsibility in accordance with section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212).

(25) *PORT OF IBERIA, LOUISIANA.*—The project for navigation, Port of Iberia, Louisiana: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 31, 2006, at a total cost of \$131,250,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$105,315,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$25,935,000; except that the Secretary, in consultation with Vermillion and Iberia Parishes, Louisiana, and consistent with the mitigation plan in the report, shall use available dredged material and rock placement on the south bank of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the west bank of the Freshwater Bayou Channel to provide incidental storm surge protection that does not adversely affect the mitigation plan.

(26) *SMITH ISLAND, SOMERSET COUNTY, MARYLAND.*—The project for environmental restoration, Smith Island, Somerset County, Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 29, 2001, at a total cost of \$15,580,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,127,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,453,000.

(27) *ROSEAU RIVER, ROSEAU, MINNESOTA.*—The project for flood damage reduction, Roseau River, Roseau, Minnesota: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 19, 2006, at a total cost of \$25,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$13,820,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$11,280,000.

(28) *ARGENTINE, EAST BOTTOMS, FAIRFAX-JERSEY CREEK, AND NORTH KANSAS LEVEES UNITS, MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES AT KANSAS CITIES, MISSOURI AND KANSAS.*—The project for flood damage reduction, Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, and North Kansas Levees units, Missouri River and tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 19, 2006, at a total cost of \$65,430,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$42,530,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$22,900,000.

(29) *SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, BLUE RIVER, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.*—The project for flood damage reduction, Swope Park Industrial Area, Blue River, Kansas City, Missouri: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 30, 2003, at a total cost of \$16,980,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,037,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,943,000.

(30) *GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NEW JERSEY.*—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 24, 2006, at a total cost of \$54,360,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$35,069,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$19,291,000, and at an estimated total cost of \$202,500,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated Federal cost of \$101,250,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$101,250,000.

(31) *HUDSON RARITAN ESTUARY, LIBERTY STATE PARK, NEW JERSEY.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for environmental restoration, Hudson Raritan Estuary, Liberty State Park, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 25, 2006, at a total cost of \$34,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$22,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$11,900,000.

(B) *RESTORATION TEAMS.*—In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall establish and utilize watershed restoration teams composed of estuary restoration experts from the Corps of Engineers, the New Jersey department of environmental protection, and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and other experts designated by the Secretary for the purpose of developing habitat restoration and water quality enhancement.

(32) *NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION STUDY, MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NEW JERSEY.*—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 30, 2003, at a total cost of \$71,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$46,735,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$25,165,000, and at an estimated total cost of \$119,680,000 for periodic beach nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated Federal cost of \$59,840,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$59,840,000.

(33) *RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NEW JERSEY.*—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Union Beach, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 4, 2006, at a total cost of \$115,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$74,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$40,200,000, and at an estimated total cost of \$6,500,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated Federal cost of \$3,250,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,250,000.

(34) *SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY.*—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and environmental restoration, South River, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 2003, at a total cost of \$122,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$79,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$42,800,000.

(35) *SOUTHWEST VALLEY, BERNALILLO COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.*—The project for flood damage reduction, Southwest Valley, Bernalillo County, New Mexico: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated November 29, 2004, at a total cost of \$24,840,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$16,150,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$8,690,000.

(36) *MONTAUK POINT, NEW YORK.*—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Montauk Point, New York: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 31, 2006, at a total cost of \$14,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$7,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,300,000.

(37) *HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONDAY CREEK, OHIO.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for ecosystem restoration, Hocking River Basin, Monday Creek, Ohio: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 24, 2006, at a total cost of \$20,980,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$13,440,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,540,000.

(B) *WAYNE NATIONAL FOREST.*—

(i) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, may construct other project features on property that is located in the Wayne National Forest, Ohio, owned by the United States and managed by the Forest Service as described in the report of the Corps of Engineers entitled "Hocking River Basin, Ohio, Monday Creek Sub-Basin Ecosystem Restoration Project Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment".

(ii) *COST.*—Each project feature carried out on Federal land shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained at Federal expense.

(iii) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this subparagraph \$1,270,000.

(38) *TOWN OF BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.*—The project for flood dam-

age reduction, town of Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pennsylvania: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 25, 2006, at a total cost of \$44,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$28,925,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$15,575,000.

(39) *PAWLEYS ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA.*—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Pawleys Island, South Carolina: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 19, 2006, at a total cost of \$8,980,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$5,840,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,140,000, and at an estimated total cost of \$21,200,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,600,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$10,600,000.

(40) *CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for navigation and ecosystem restoration, Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 2, 2003, at a total cost of \$188,110,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$87,810,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$100,300,000.

(B) *NAVIGATIONAL SERVITUDE.*—In carrying out the project under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall enforce the navigational servitude in the Corpus Christi Ship Channel (including the removal or relocation of any facility obstructing the project) consistent with the cost sharing requirements of section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211).

(41) *GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, MATAGORDA BAY RE-ROUTE, TEXAS.*—The project for navigation, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazos River to Port O'Connor, Matagorda Bay Re-Route, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 24, 2002, at a total cost of \$17,280,000. The costs of construction of the project are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(42) *GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TEXAS.*—The project for navigation, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, High Island to Brazos River, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 16, 2004, at a total cost of \$14,450,000. The costs of construction of the project are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(43) *LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PHASE 1, TEXAS.*—The project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Lower Colorado River Basin Phase 1, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 31, 2006, at a total cost of \$110,730,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$69,640,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$41,090,000.

(44) *ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, DEEP CREEK, CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA.*—The project for Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement, Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 3, 2003, at a total cost of \$37,200,000.

(45) *CRANEY ISLAND EASTWARD EXPANSION, NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, HAMPTON ROADS, VIRGINIA.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for navigation, Craney Island Eastward Expansion, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Hampton Roads, Virginia: Report of Chief of Engineers dated October 24, 2006, at a total cost of \$712,103,000.

(B) *NON-FEDERAL SHARE.*—Notwithstanding sections 101 and 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 and 2213), the Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 50 percent.

(46) *CENTRALIA, CHEHALIS RIVER, LEWIS COUNTY, WASHINGTON.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for flood damage reduction, Centralia, Chehalis River, Lewis

County, Washington: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 27, 2004, at a total cost of \$123,770,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$74,740,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$49,030,000.

(B) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall—

(i) credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project up to \$6,500,000 for the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest in accordance with the project study plan dated November 28, 1999; and

(ii) credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

#### SEC. 1002. SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s):

(1) HALEYVILLE, ALABAMA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Haleyville, Alabama.

(2) WEISS LAKE, ALABAMA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Weiss Lake, Alabama.

(3) FORT YUKON, ALASKA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Fort Yukon, Alaska.

(4) LITTLE COLORADO RIVER LEVEE, ARIZONA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Little Colorado River Levee, Arizona.

(5) CACHE RIVER BASIN, GRUBBS, ARKANSAS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Cache River Basin, Grubbs, Arkansas.

(6) BARREL SPRINGS WASH, PALMDALE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Barrel Springs Wash, Palmdale, California.

(7) BORREGO SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Borrego Springs, California.

(8) COLTON, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Colton, California.

(9) DUNLAP STREAM, YUCAIPA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Dunlap Stream, Yucaipa, California.

(10) HUNTS CANYON WASH, PALMDALE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Hunts Canyon Wash, Palmdale, California.

(11) ONTARIO AND CHINO, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Ontario and Chino, California.

(12) SANTA VENETIA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Santa Venetia, California.

(13) WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Whittier, California.

(14) WILDWOOD CREEK, YUCAIPA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Wildwood Creek, Yucaipa, California.

(15) BIBB COUNTY AND CITY OF MACON LEVEE, GEORGIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Bibb County and City of Macon Levee, Georgia.

(16) FORT WAYNE AND VICINITY, INDIANA.—Project for flood damage reduction, St. Mary's and Maumee Rivers, Fort Wayne and vicinity, Indiana.

(17) ST. FRANCISVILLE, LOUISIANA.—Project for flood damage reduction, St. Francisville, Louisiana.

(18) SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Salem, Massachusetts.

(19) CASS RIVER, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood damage reduction, Cass River, Vassar and vicinity, Michigan.

(20) CROW RIVER, ROCKFORD, MINNESOTA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Crow River, Rockford, Minnesota.

(21) MARSH CREEK, MINNESOTA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Marsh Creek, Minnesota.

(22) SOUTH BRANCH OF THE WILD RICE RIVER, BORUP, MINNESOTA.—Project for flood damage reduction, South Branch of the Wild Rice River, Borup, Minnesota.

(23) BLACKSNAKE CREEK, ST. JOSEPH, MISSOURI.—Project for flood damage reduction, Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, Missouri.

(24) ACID BROOK, POMPTON LAKES, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood damage reduction, Acid Brook, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey.

(25) CANISTEO RIVER, ADDISON, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Canisteo River, Addison, New York.

(26) COHOCTON RIVER, CAMPBELL, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Cohocton River, Campbell, New York.

(27) DRY AND OTTER CREEKS, CORTLAND, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Dry and Otter Creeks, Cortland, New York.

(28) EAST RIVER, SILVER BEACH, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, East River, Silver Beach, New York City, New York.

(29) EAST VALLEY CREEK, ANDOVER, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, East Valley Creek, Andover, New York.

(30) SUNNYSIDE BROOK, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Sunnyside Brook, Westchester County, New York.

(31) LITTLE YANKEE AND MUD RUN, TRUMBULL COUNTY, OHIO.—Project for flood damage reduction, Little Yankee and Mud Run, Trumbull County, Ohio.

(32) LITTLE NESHAMINY CREEK, WARRINGTON, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Little Neshaminy Creek, Warrington, Pennsylvania.

(33) SOUTHAMPTON CREEK WATERSHED, SOUTHAMPTON, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Southampton Creek watershed, Southampton, Pennsylvania.

(34) SPRING CREEK, LOWER MACUNGIE TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Spring Creek, Lower Macungie Township, Pennsylvania.

(35) YARDLEY AQUEDUCT, SILVER AND BROCK CREEKS, YARDLEY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Yardley Aqueduct, Silver and Brock Creeks, Yardley, Pennsylvania.

(36) SURFSIDE BEACH, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Surfside Beach and vicinity, South Carolina.

(37) SANDY CREEK, JACKSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—A project for flood damage reduction, Sandy Creek, Jackson County, Tennessee.

(38) CONGELOSI DITCH, MISSOURI CITY, TEXAS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Congelosi Ditch, Missouri City, Texas.

(39) DILLEY, TEXAS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Dilley, Texas.

(40) CHEYENNE, WYOMING.—Project for flood damage reduction, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) CACHE RIVER BASIN, GRUBBS, ARKANSAS.—The Secretary may proceed with the project for the Cache River Basin, Grubbs, Arkansas, referred to in subsection (a)(5), notwithstanding that the project is located within the boundaries of the flood control project, Cache River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, (64 Stat. 172) and modified by section 99 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 41).

(2) ONTARIO AND CHINO, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for flood damage reduction, Ontario and Chino, California, referred to in subsection (a)(11) if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

(3) SANTA VENETIA, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for flood damage reduction, Santa Venetia, California, referred to in subsection (a)(12) if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible and shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

(4) WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for flood damage re-

duction, Whittier, California, referred to in subsection (a)(13) if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

(5) WILDWOOD CREEK, YUCAIPA, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall review the locally prepared plan for the project for flood damage, Wildwood Creek, California, referred to in subsection (a)(14) and, if the Secretary determines that the plan meets the evaluation and design standards of the Corps of Engineers and that the plan is feasible, the Secretary may use the plan to carry out the project and shall provide credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

(6) FORT WAYNE AND VICINITY, INDIANA.—In carrying out the project for flood damage reduction, St. Mary's and Maumee Rivers, Fort Wayne and vicinity, Indiana, referred to in subsection (a)(16) the Secretary shall—

(A) provide a 100-year level of flood protection at the Berry Thieme, Park-Thompson, Woodhurst, and Tillman sites along the St. Mary's River; and

(B) allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

(7) SOUTH BRANCH OF THE WILD RICE RIVER, BORUP, MINNESOTA.—In carrying out the project for flood damage reduction, South Branch of the Wild Rice River, Borup, Minnesota, referred to in subsection (a)(22) the Secretary may consider national ecosystem restoration benefits in determining the Federal interest in the project and shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

(8) ACID BROOK, POMPTON LAKES, NEW JERSEY.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for flood damage reduction, Acid Brook, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey, referred to in subsection (a)(24) if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

(9) SANDY CREEK, TENNESSEE.—Consistent with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 24, 1948, on the West Tennessee Tributaries project, in carrying out the project for flood damage reduction, Sandy Creek, Tennessee, referred to in section (a)(37)—

(A) Sandy Creek shall not be considered to be an authorized channel of the West Tennessee Tributaries project; and

(B) the project shall not be considered to be part of the West Tennessee Tributaries project.

(10) DILLEY, TEXAS.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for flood damage reduction, Dilley, Texas, referred to in subsection (a)(39) if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

#### SEC. 1003. SMALL PROJECTS FOR EMERGENCY STREAMBANK PROTECTION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r):

(1) ALISO CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—Projects for emergency streambank protection, Aliso Creek, California.

(2) ST. JOHNS BLUFF TRAINING WALL, DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for emergency streambank protection, St. Johns Bluff Training Wall, Duval County, Florida.

(3) GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, IBERVILLE PARISH, LOUISIANA.—Projects for emergency streambank protection, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Iberville Parish, Louisiana.

(4) OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, ARKANSAS AND LOUISIANA.—Projects for emergency



streambank protection, Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana.

(5) PINEY POINT LIGHTHOUSE, ST. MARY'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Piney Point Lighthouse, St. Mary's County, Maryland.

(6) PUG HOLE LAKE, MINNESOTA.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Pug Hole Lake, Minnesota.

(7) MIDDLE FORK GRAND RIVER, GENTRY COUNTY, MISSOURI.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Middle Fork Grand River, Gentry County, Missouri.

(8) PLATTE RIVER, PLATTE CITY, MISSOURI.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Platte River, Platte City, Missouri.

(9) RUSH CREEK, PARKVILLE, MISSOURI.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Rush Creek, Parkville, Missouri, including measures to address degradation of the creek bed.

(10) DRY AND OTTER CREEKS, CORTLAND COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Dry and Otter Creeks, Cortland County, New York.

(11) KEUKA LAKE, HAMMONDSPORT, NEW YORK.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Keuka Lake, Hammondsport, New York.

(12) KOWAWESE UNIQUE AREA AND HUDSON RIVER, NEW WINDSOR, NEW YORK.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Kowawese Unique Area and Hudson River, New Windsor, New York.

(13) OWEGO CREEK, TIOGA COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Owego Creek, Tioga County, New York.

(14) HOWARD ROAD OUTFALL, SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Howard Road outfall, Shelby County, Tennessee.

(15) MITCH FARM DITCH AND LATERAL D, SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Mitch Farm Ditch and Lateral D, Shelby County, Tennessee.

(16) WOLF RIVER TRIBUTARIES, SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Wolf River tributaries, Shelby County, Tennessee.

(17) JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON, TEXAS.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas.

(18) WELLS RIVER, NEWBURY, VERMONT.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Wells River, Newbury, Vermont.

#### SEC. 1004. SMALL PROJECTS FOR NAVIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577):

(1) BARROW HARBOR, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Barrow Harbor, Alaska.

(2) COFFMAN COVE, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Coffman Cove, Alaska.

(3) KOTZEBUE HARBOR, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Kotzebue Harbor, Alaska.

(4) NOME HARBOR, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Nome Harbor, Alaska.

(5) OLD HARBOR, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Old Harbor, Alaska.

(6) LITTLE ROCK PORT, ARKANSAS.—Project for navigation, Little Rock Port, Arkansas River, Arkansas.

(7) MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.—Project for navigation, Mississippi River Ship Channel, Louisiana.

(8) EAST BASIN, CAPE COD CANAL, SANDWICH, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for navigation, East Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Sandwich, Massachusetts.

(9) LYNN HARBOR, LYNN, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for navigation, Lynn Harbor, Lynn, Massachusetts.

(10) MERRIMACK RIVER, HAVERHILL, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for navigation, Merrimack River, Haverhill, Massachusetts.

(11) OAK BLUFFS HARBOR, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for navigation, Oak Bluffs Harbor, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts.

(12) WOODS HOLE GREAT HARBOR, FALMOUTH, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for navigation, Woods Hole Great Harbor, Falmouth, Massachusetts.

(13) AU SABLE RIVER, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Au Sable River in the vicinity of Oscoda, Michigan.

(14) CLINTON RIVER, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Clinton River, Michigan.

(15) ONTONAGON RIVER, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Ontonagon River, Ontonagon, Michigan.

(16) OUTER CHANNEL AND INNER HARBOR, MENOMINEE HARBOR, MICHIGAN AND WISCONSIN.—Project for navigation, Outer Channel and Inner Harbor, Menominee Harbor, Michigan and Wisconsin.

(17) SEBEWAING RIVER, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Sebewaing River, Michigan.

(18) TRAVERSE CITY HARBOR, TRAVERSE CITY, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Traverse City Harbor, Traverse City, Michigan.

(19) TOWER HARBOR, TOWER, MINNESOTA.—Project for navigation, Tower Harbor, Tower, Minnesota.

(20) OLCOTT HARBOR, OLCOTT, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Olcott Harbor, Olcott, New York.

(21) MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WISCONSIN.—Project for navigation, Milwaukee Harbor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) TRAVERSE CITY HARBOR, TRAVERSE CITY, MICHIGAN.—The Secretary shall review the locally prepared plan for the project for navigation, Traverse City Harbor, Michigan, referred to in subsection (a)(18), and, if the Secretary determines that the plan meets the evaluation and design standards of the Corps of Engineers and that the plan is feasible, the Secretary may use the plan to carry out the project and shall provide credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

(2) TOWER HARBOR, TOWER MINNESOTA.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for navigation, Tower Harbor, Tower, Minnesota, referred to in subsection (a)(19) if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

#### SEC. 1005. SMALL PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is appropriate, may carry out the project under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a):

(1) BALLONA CREEK, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Ballona Creek, Los Angeles County, California.

(2) BALLONA LAGOON TIDE GATES, MARINA DEL REY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Ballona Lagoon Tide Gates, Marina Del Rey, California.

(3) FT. GEORGE INLET, DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Ft. George Inlet, Duval County, Florida.

(4) RATHBUN LAKE, IOWA.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rathbun Lake, Iowa.

(5) SMITHVILLE LAKE, MISSOURI.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Smithville Lake, Missouri.

(6) DELAWARE BAY, NEW JERSEY AND DELAWARE.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Delaware Bay, New Jersey and Delaware, for the purpose of oyster restoration.

(7) TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for improvement of the quality of the en-

vironment, Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania.

#### SEC. 1006. SMALL PROJECTS FOR AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is appropriate, may carry out the project under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330):

(1) CYPRESS CREEK, MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Cypress Creek, Montgomery, Alabama.

(2) BLACK LAKE, ALASKA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Black Lake, Alaska, at the head of the Chignik watershed.

(3) BEN LOMOND DAM, SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Ben Lomond Dam, Santa Cruz, California.

(4) DOCKWEILER BLUFFS, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Dockweiler Bluffs, Los Angeles County, California.

(5) SALT RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Salt River, California.

(6) SAN DIEGO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, San Diego River, California, including efforts to address aquatic nuisance species.

(7) SANTA ROSA CREEK, SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Santa Rosa Creek in the vicinity of the Prince Memorial Greenway, Santa Rosa, California.

(8) STOCKTON DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL AND LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel and lower San Joaquin River, California.

(9) SUISUN MARSH, SAN PABLO BAY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Suisun Marsh, San Pablo Bay, California.

(10) SWEETWATER RESERVOIR, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, California, including efforts to address aquatic nuisance species.

(11) BISCAYNE BAY, FLORIDA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Biscayne Bay, Key Biscayne, Florida.

(12) CLAM BAYOU AND DINKINS BAYOU, SANIBEL ISLAND, FLORIDA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Clam Bayou and Dinkins Bayou, Sanibel Island, Florida.

(13) MOUNTAIN PARK, GEORGIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Mountain Park, Georgia.

(14) CHATTAHOOCHEE FALL LINE, GEORGIA AND ALABAMA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama.

(15) LONGWOOD COVE, GAINESVILLE, GEORGIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Longwood Cove, Gainesville, Georgia.

(16) CITY PARK, UNIVERSITY LAKES, LOUISIANA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, City Park, University Lakes, Louisiana.

(17) LAWRENCE GATEWAY, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration at the Lawrence Gateway quadrant project along the Merrimack and Spicket Rivers in Lawrence, Massachusetts, in accordance with the general conditions established by the project approval of the Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, including filling abandoned drainage facilities and making improvements to the drainage system on the Lawrence Gateway to prevent continued migration of contaminated sediments into the river systems.

(18) MILFORD POND, MILFORD, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Milford Pond, Milford, Massachusetts.

(19) MILL POND, LITTLETON, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Mill Pond, Littleton, Massachusetts.

(20) PINE TREE BROOK, MILTON, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts.



(21) CLINTON RIVER, MICHIGAN.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Clinton River, Michigan.

(22) KALAMAZOO RIVER WATERSHED, BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Kalamazoo River watershed, Battle Creek, Michigan.

(23) RUSH LAKE, MINNESOTA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Rush Lake, Minnesota.

(24) SOUTH FORK OF THE CROW RIVER, HUTCHINSON, MINNESOTA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, South Fork of the Crow River, Hutchinson, Minnesota.

(25) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, St. Louis, Missouri.

(26) MOBLEY DAM, TONGUE RIVER, MONTANA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Mobley Dam, Tongue River, Montana.

(27) S AND H DAM, TONGUE RIVER, MONTANA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, S and H Dam, Tongue River, Montana.

(28) VANDALIA DAM, MILK RIVER, MONTANA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Vandalia Dam, Milk River, Montana.

(29) TRUCKEE RIVER, RENO, NEVADA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Truckee River, Reno, Nevada, including features for fish passage in Washoe County.

(30) GROVER'S MILL POND, NEW JERSEY.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Grover's Mill Pond, New Jersey.

(31) CALDWELL COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Caldwell County, North Carolina.

(32) MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina.

(33) DUGWAY CREEK, BRATENAH, OHIO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Dugway Creek, Bratenahl, Ohio.

(34) JOHNSON CREEK, GRESHAM, OREGON.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Johnson Creek, Gresham, Oregon.

(35) BEAVER CREEK, BEAVER AND SALEM, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Beaver Creek, Beaver and Salem, Pennsylvania.

(36) CEMENTON DAM, LEHIGH RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Cementon Dam, Lehigh River, Pennsylvania.

(37) INGHAM SPRING DAM, SOLEBURY TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania.

(38) SAUCON CREEK, NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Saucun Creek, Northampton County, Pennsylvania.

(39) STILLWATER LAKE DAM, MONROE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Stillwater Lake Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania.

(40) BLACKSTONE RIVER, RHODE ISLAND.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Blackstone River, Rhode Island.

(41) WILSON BRANCH, CHERAW, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Wilson Branch, Cheraw, South Carolina.

(42) WHITE RIVER, BETHEL, VERMONT.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, White River, Bethel, Vermont.

(43) COLLEGE LAKE, LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, College Lake, Lynchburg, Virginia.

#### (b) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) BLACK LAKE, ALASKA.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Black Lake, Alaska referred to in subsection (a)(2) if the Secretary determines that the project is appropriate.

(2) TRUCKEE RIVER, RENO, NEVADA.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Truckee River, Reno, Nevada, referred to in subsection (a)(29) shall be \$6,000,000 and the Secretary shall carry out the project if the

Secretary determines that the project is appropriate.

(3) BLACKSTONE RIVER, RHODE ISLAND.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Blackstone River, Rhode Island, referred to in subsection (a)(40) if the Secretary determines that the project is appropriate.

(4) COLLEGE LAKE, LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, College Lake, Lynchburg, Virginia, referred to in subsection (a)(43) if the Secretary determines that the project is appropriate.

#### SEC. 1007. SMALL PROJECTS FOR SHORELINE PROTECTION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g):

(1) NELSON LAGOON, ALASKA.—Project for shoreline protection, Nelson Lagoon, Alaska.

(2) NICHOLAS CANYON, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA.—Project for shoreline protection, Nicholas Canyon, Los Angeles, California.

(3) SANIBEL ISLAND, FLORIDA.—Project for shoreline protection, Sanibel Island, Florida.

(4) APRHA HARBOR, GUAM.—Project for shoreline protection, Apra Harbor, Guam.

(5) PITI, CABRAS ISLAND, GUAM.—Project for shoreline protection, Piti, Cabras Island, Guam.

(6) NARROWS AND GRAVESEND BAY, UPPER NEW YORK BAY, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK.—Project for shoreline protection in the vicinity of the confluence of the Narrows and Gravesend Bay, Upper New York Bay, Shore Parkway Greenway, Brooklyn, New York.

(7) DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for shoreline protection, Delaware River in the vicinity of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pennsylvania.

(8) PORT ARANSAS, TEXAS.—Project for shoreline protection, Port Aransas, Texas.

#### SEC. 1008. SMALL PROJECTS FOR SNAGGING AND SEDIMENT REMOVAL.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for the following project and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary may carry out the project under section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937 (33 U.S.C. 701g): Project for removal of snags and clearing and straightening of channels for flood control, Kowaues Unique Area and Hudson River, New Windsor, New York.

#### SEC. 1009. SMALL PROJECTS TO PREVENT OR MITIGATE DAMAGE CAUSED BY NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i):

(1) Tybee Island, Georgia.

(2) Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana.

#### SEC. 1010. SMALL PROJECTS FOR AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a project for aquatic nuisance plant control in the Republican River Basin, Nebraska, under section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610).

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In carrying out the project under subsection (a), the Secretary may control and eradicate riverine nuisance plants.

### TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### SEC. 2001. NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(n) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—

"(1) PROHIBITION ON SOLICITATION OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary may not—

"(A) solicit contributions from non-Federal interests for costs of constructing authorized

water resources projects or measures in excess of the non-Federal share assigned to the appropriate project purposes listed in subsections (a), (b), and (c); or

"(B) condition Federal participation in such projects or measures on the receipt of such contributions.

"(2) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the Secretary's authority under section 903(c)."

#### SEC. 2002. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

Section 214(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; 114 Stat. 2594; 119 Stat. 2169; 120 Stat. 318; 120 Stat. 3197) is amended by striking "2008" and inserting "2009".

#### SEC. 2003. WRITTEN AGREEMENT FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) is amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 221." and inserting the following:

"SEC. 221. WRITTEN AGREEMENT REQUIREMENT FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS.;"

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"(a) COOPERATION OF NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—After December 31, 1970, the construction of any water resources project, or an acceptable separable element thereof, by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, or by a non-Federal interest where such interest will be reimbursed for such construction under any provision of law, shall not be commenced until each non-Federal interest has entered into a written partnership agreement with the Secretary (or, where appropriate, the district engineer for the district in which the project will be carried out) under which each party agrees to carry out its responsibilities and requirements for implementation or construction of the project or the appropriate element of the project, as the case may be; except that no such agreement shall be required if the Secretary determines that the administrative costs associated with negotiating, executing, or administering the agreement would exceed the amount of the contribution required from the non-Federal interest and are less than \$25,000.

"(2) LIQUIDATED DAMAGES.—A partnership agreement described in paragraph (1) may include a provision for liquidated damages in the event of a failure of one or more parties to perform.

"(3) OBLIGATION OF FUTURE APPROPRIATIONS.—In any partnership agreement described in paragraph (1) and entered into by a State, or a body politic of the State which derives its powers from the State constitution, or a governmental entity created by the State legislature, the agreement may reflect that it does not obligate future appropriations for such performance and payment when obligating future appropriations would be inconsistent with constitutional or statutory limitations of the State or a political subdivision of the State.

"(4) CREDIT FOR IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A partnership agreement described in paragraph (1) may provide with respect to a project that the Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project, including a project implemented without specific authorization in law, the value of in-kind contributions made by the non-Federal interest, including—

"(i) the costs of planning (including data collection), design, management, mitigation, construction, and construction services that are provided by the non-Federal interest for implementation of the project;

"(ii) the value of materials or services provided before execution of the partnership agreement, including efforts on constructed elements incorporated into the project; and

“(iii) the value of materials and services provided after execution of the partnership agreement.

“(B) **CONDITION.**—The Secretary may credit an in-kind contribution under subparagraph (A) only if the Secretary determines that the material or service provided as an in-kind contribution is integral to the project.

“(C) **WORK PERFORMED BEFORE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.**—In any case in which the non-Federal interest is to receive credit under subparagraph (A)(ii) for the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest and such work has not been carried out as of the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement under which the non-Federal interest shall carry out such work, and only work carried out following the execution of the agreement shall be eligible for credit.

“(D) **LIMITATIONS.**—Credit authorized under this paragraph for a project—

“(i) shall not exceed the non-Federal share of the cost of the project;

“(ii) shall not alter any other requirement that a non-Federal interest provide lands, easements, relocations, rights-of-way, or areas for disposal of dredged material for the project;

“(iii) shall not alter any requirement that a non-Federal interest pay a portion of the costs of construction of the project under sections 101 and 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211; 33 U.S.C. 2213); and

“(iv) shall not exceed the actual and reasonable costs of the materials, services, or other things provided by the non-Federal interest, as determined by the Secretary.

“(E) **APPLICABILITY.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—This paragraph shall apply to water resources projects authorized after November 16, 1986, including projects initiated after November 16, 1986, without specific authorization in law.

“(ii) **LIMITATION.**—In any case in which a specific provision of law provides for a non-Federal interest to receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a study for, or construction or operation and maintenance of, a water resources project, the specific provision of law shall apply instead of this paragraph.”

(b) **NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—Section 221(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **DEFINITION OF NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—The term ‘non-Federal interest’ means—

“(1) a legally constituted public body (including a federally recognized Indian tribe); or

“(2) a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government, that has full authority and capability to perform the terms of its agreement and to pay damages, if necessary, in the event of failure to perform.”

(c) **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 221 of such Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Not later than June 30, 2008, the Secretary shall issue policies and guidelines for partnership agreements that delegate to the district engineers, at a minimum—

“(1) the authority to approve any policy in a partnership agreement that has appeared in an agreement previously approved by the Secretary;

“(2) the authority to approve any policy in a partnership agreement the specific terms of which are dictated by law or by a final feasibility study, final environmental impact statement, or other final decision document for a water resources project;

“(3) the authority to approve any partnership agreement that complies with the policies and guidelines issued by the Secretary; and

“(4) the authority to sign any partnership agreement for any water resources project unless, within 30 days of the date of authorization

of the project, the Secretary notifies the district engineer in which the project will be carried out that the Secretary wishes to retain the prerogative to sign the partnership agreement for that project.

“(f) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report detailing the following:

“(1) The number of partnership agreements signed by district engineers and the number of partnership agreements signed by the Secretary.

“(2) For any partnership agreement signed by the Secretary, an explanation of why delegation to the district engineer was not appropriate.

“(g) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Chief of Engineers shall—

“(1) ensure that each district engineer has made available to the public, including on the Internet, all partnership agreements entered into under this section within the preceding 10 years and all partnership agreements for water resources projects currently being carried out in that district; and

“(2) make each partnership agreement entered into after such date of enactment available to the public, including on the Internet, not later than 7 days after the date on which such agreement is entered into.”

(d) **LOCAL COOPERATION.**—Section 912(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (101 Stat. 4190) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “shall” the first place it appears and inserting “may”; and

(B) by striking the last sentence; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting after “injunction, for” the following: “payment of damages or, for”;

(B) by striking “to collect a civil penalty imposed under this section.”; and

(C) by striking “any civil penalty imposed under this section,” and inserting “any damages.”

(e) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) only apply to partnership agreements entered into after the date of enactment of this Act; except that, at the request of a non-Federal interest for a project, the district engineer for the district in which the project is located may amend a project partnership agreement entered into on or before such date and under which construction on the project has not been initiated as of such date of enactment for the purpose of incorporating such amendments.

(f) **AGREEMENTS AND REFERENCES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A goal of agreements entered into under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) shall be to further partnership and cooperation, and the agreements shall be referred to as “partnership agreements”.

(2) **REFERENCES TO COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.**—Any reference in a law, regulation, document, or other paper of the United States to a “cooperation agreement” or “project cooperation agreement” shall be deemed to be a reference to a “partnership agreement” or a “project partnership agreement”, respectively.

(3) **REFERENCES TO PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—Any reference to a “partnership agreement” or “project partnership agreement” in this Act (other than this section) shall be deemed to be a reference to a “cooperation agreement” or a “project cooperation agreement”, respectively.

#### SEC. 2004. COMPILATION OF LAWS.

(a) **COMPILATION OF LAWS ENACTED AFTER NOVEMBER 8, 1966.**—The Secretary and the Chief of Engineers shall prepare a compilation of the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors, flood damage reduction, beach and shoreline erosion, hurricane and storm damage reduction, ecosystem

and environmental restoration, and other water resources development enacted after November 8, 1966, and before January 1, 2008, and have such compilation printed for the use of the Department of the Army, Congress, and the general public.

(b) **REPRINT OF LAWS ENACTED BEFORE NOVEMBER 8, 1966.**—The Secretary shall have the volumes containing the laws referred to in subsection (a) enacted before November 8, 1966, reprinted.

(c) **INDEX.**—The Secretary shall include an index in each volume compiled, and each volume reprinted, pursuant to this section.

(d) **CONGRESSIONAL COPIES.**—Not later than April 1, 2008, the Secretary shall transmit at least 25 copies of each volume compiled, and of each volume reprinted, pursuant to this section to each of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(e) **AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that each volume compiled, and each volume reprinted, pursuant to this section are available through electronic means, including on the Internet.

#### SEC. 2005. DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL.

Section 217 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2326a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **DREDGED MATERIAL FACILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may enter into a partnership agreement under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) with one or more non-Federal interests with respect to a water resources project, or group of water resources projects within a geographic region, if appropriate, for the acquisition, design, construction, management, or operation of a dredged material processing, treatment, contaminant reduction, or disposal facility (including any facility used to demonstrate potential beneficial uses of dredged material, which may include effective sediment contaminant reduction technologies) using funds provided in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

“(2) **PERFORMANCE.**—One or more of the parties to a partnership agreement under this subsection may perform the acquisition, design, construction, management, or operation of a dredged material processing, treatment, contaminant reduction, or disposal facility.

“(3) **MULTIPLE PROJECTS.**—If appropriate, the Secretary may combine portions of separate water resources projects with appropriate combined cost-sharing among the various water resources projects in a partnership agreement for a facility under this subsection if the facility serves to manage dredged material from multiple water resources projects located in the geographic region of the facility.

“(4) **SPECIFIED FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES AND COST SHARING.**—

“(A) **SPECIFIED FEDERAL FUNDING.**—A partnership agreement with respect to a facility under this subsection shall specify—

“(i) the Federal funding sources and combined cost-sharing when applicable to multiple water resources projects; and

“(ii) the responsibilities and risks of each of the parties relating to present and future dredged material managed by the facility.

“(B) **MANAGEMENT OF SEDIMENTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A partnership agreement under this subsection may include the management of sediments from the maintenance dredging of Federal water resources projects that do not have partnership agreements.

“(ii) **PAYMENTS.**—A partnership agreement under this subsection may allow the non-Federal interest to receive reimbursable payments from the Federal Government for commitments

made by the non-Federal interest for disposal or placement capacity at dredged material processing, treatment, contaminant reduction, or disposal facilities.

“(C) CREDIT.—A partnership agreement under this subsection may allow costs incurred by the non-Federal interest before execution of the partnership agreement to be credited in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

“(5) CREDIT.—

“(A) EFFECT ON EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this subsection supersedes or modifies an agreement in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph between the Federal Government and any non-Federal interest for the cost-sharing, construction, and operation and maintenance of a water resources project.

“(B) CREDIT FOR FUNDS.—Subject to the approval of the Secretary and in accordance with law (including regulations and policies) in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph, a non-Federal interest for a water resources project may receive credit for funds provided for the acquisition, design, construction, management, or operation of a dredged material processing, treatment, contaminant reduction, or disposal facility to the extent the facility is used to manage dredged material from the project.

“(C) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST RESPONSIBILITIES.—A non-Federal interest entering into a partnership agreement under this subsection for a facility shall—

“(i) be responsible for providing all necessary lands, easements, relocations, and rights-of-way associated with the facility; and

“(ii) receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project with respect to which the agreement is being entered into for those items.”; and

(3) in paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) by inserting “and maintenance” after “operation” each place it appears; and

(B) by inserting “processing, treatment, contaminant reduction, or” after “dredged material” the first place it appears in each of those paragraphs.

#### SEC. 2006. REMOTE AND SUBSISTENCE HARBORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In conducting a study of harbor and navigation improvements, the Secretary may recommend a project without the need to demonstrate that the project is justified solely by national economic development benefits if the Secretary determines that—

(1)(A) the community to be served by the project is at least 70 miles from the nearest surface accessible commercial port and has no direct rail or highway link to another community served by a surface accessible port or harbor; or

(B) the project would be located in the State of Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, or American Samoa;

(2) the harbor is economically critical such that over 80 percent of the goods transported through the harbor would be consumed within the community served by the harbor and navigation improvement; and

(3) the long-term viability of the community would be threatened without the harbor and navigation improvement.

(b) JUSTIFICATION.—In considering whether to recommend a project under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider the benefits of the project to—

(1) public health and safety of the local community, including access to facilities designed to protect public health and safety;

(2) access to natural resources for subsistence purposes;

(3) local and regional economic opportunities;

(4) welfare of the local population; and

(5) social and cultural value to the community.

#### SEC. 2007. USE OF OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS.

The non-Federal interest for a water resources study or project may use, and the Secretary

shall accept, funds provided by a Federal agency under any other Federal program, to satisfy, in whole or in part, the non-Federal share of the cost of the study or project if the Federal agency that provides the funds determines that the funds are authorized to be used to carry out the study or project.

#### SEC. 2008. REVISION OF PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT; COST SHARING.

(a) FEDERAL ALLOCATION.—Upon authorization by law of an increase in the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allocated for a water resources project or an increase in the total cost of a water resources project authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, the Secretary shall enter into a revised partnership agreement for the project to take into account the change in Federal participation in the project.

(b) COST SHARING.—An increase in the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allocated for a water resources project, or an increase in the total cost of a water resources project, authorized to be carried out by the Secretary shall not affect any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the project.

(c) COST ESTIMATES.—The estimated Federal and non-Federal costs of water resources projects authorized to be carried out by the Secretary before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act are for informational purposes only and shall not be interpreted as affecting the cost-sharing responsibilities established by law.

#### SEC. 2009. EXPEDITED ACTIONS FOR EMERGENCY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION.

The Secretary shall expedite any authorized planning, design, and construction of any project for flood damage reduction for an area that, within the preceding 5 years, has been subject to flooding that resulted in the loss of life and caused damage of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant a declaration of a major disaster by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

#### SEC. 2010. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.

Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a; 114 Stat. 2587–2588; 100 Stat. 4164) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) Tuscarawas River Basin, Ohio;

“(7) Sauk River Basin, Snohomish and Skagit Counties, Washington;

“(8) Niagara River Basin, New York;

“(9) Genesee River Basin, New York; and

“(10) White River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (1) of subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(1) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the costs of an assessment carried out under this section on or after December 11, 2000, shall be 25 percent.”; and

(3) by striking subsection (g).

#### SEC. 2011. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—Section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269(b); 114 Stat. 2589) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting “carry out water-related planning activities and” after “the Secretary may”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B) by inserting after “Code” the following: “; and including lands that are within the jurisdictional area of an Oklahoma Indian tribe, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and are recognized by the Secretary of the Interior as eligible for trust land status under part 151 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) watershed assessments and planning activities; and”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 203(e) of such Act is amended by striking “2006” and inserting “2012”.

#### SEC. 2012. WILDFIRE FIREFIGHTING.

Section 309 of Public Law 102–154 (42 U.S.C. 1856a–1; 105 Stat. 1034) is amended by inserting “the Secretary of the Army,” after “the Secretary of Energy.”.

#### SEC. 2013. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) FEDERAL STATE COOPERATION.—

“(1) COMPREHENSIVE PLANS.—The Secretary”;

(2) by inserting after the last sentence in subsection (a) the following:

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a governmental agency or non-Federal interest, the Secretary may provide, at Federal expense, technical assistance to such agency or non-Federal interest in managing water resources.

“(B) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—Technical assistance under this paragraph may include provision and integration of hydrologic, economic, and environmental data and analyses.”;

(3) in subsection (b)(1) by striking “this section” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”;

(4) in subsection (b)(2) by striking “Up to 1/2 of the” and inserting “The”;

(5) in subsection (c) by striking “(c) There is” and inserting the following:

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) FEDERAL AND STATE COOPERATION.—There is”;

(6) in subsection (c)(1) (as designated by paragraph (5))—

(A) by striking “the provisions of this section” and inserting “subsection (a)(1).”; and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$2,000,000”;

(7) by inserting at the end of subsection (c) the following:

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 annually to carry out subsection (a)(2), of which not more than \$2,000,000 annually may be used by the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with nonprofit organizations to provide assistance to rural and small communities.”;

(8) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(9) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) ANNUAL SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITIES.—Concurrent with the President’s submission to Congress of the President’s request for appropriations for the Civil Works Program for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the individual activities proposed for funding under subsection (a)(1) for that fiscal year.”.

#### SEC. 2014. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148; 110 Stat. 3758; 113 Stat. 295) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at end of paragraph (18);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (19) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(20) Kinkaid Lake, Jackson County, Illinois, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address excessive sedimentation;

“(21) McCarter Pond, Borough of Fairhaven, New Jersey, removal of silt and measures to address water quality;

“(22) Rogers Pond, Franklin Township, New Jersey, removal of silt and restoration of structural integrity;

“(23) Greenwood Lake, New York and New Jersey, removal of silt and aquatic growth;

“(24) Lake Rodgers, Creedmoor, North Carolina, removal of silt and excessive nutrients and restoration of structural integrity;

“(25) Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address excessive sedimentation;

“(26) Lake Luxembourg, Pennsylvania;

“(27) Lake Fairlee, Vermont, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address excessive sedimentation; and

“(28) Lake Morley, Vermont, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address excessive sedimentation.”.

#### SEC. 2015. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purpose of expediting the cost-effective design and construction of wetlands restoration that is part of an authorized water resources project, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements under section 6305 of title 31, United States Code, with nonprofit organizations with expertise in wetlands restoration to carry out such design and construction on behalf of the Secretary.

(b) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **PER PROJECT LIMIT.**—A cooperative agreement under this section may not obligate the Secretary to pay the nonprofit organization more than \$1,000,000 for any single wetlands restoration project.

(2) **ANNUAL LIMIT.**—The total value of work carried out under cooperative agreements under this section may not exceed \$5,000,000 in any fiscal year.

#### SEC. 2016. TRAINING FUNDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may include individuals not employed by the Department of the Army in training classes and courses offered by the Corps of Engineers in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is in the best interest of the Federal Government to include those individuals as participants.

(b) **EXPENSES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual not employed by the Department of the Army attending a training class or course described in subsection (a) shall pay the full cost of the training provided to the individual.

(2) **PAYMENTS.**—Payments made by an individual for training received under paragraph (1), up to the actual cost of the training—

(A) may be retained by the Secretary;

(B) shall be credited to an appropriations account used for paying training costs; and

(C) shall be available for use by the Secretary, without further appropriation, for training purposes.

(3) **EXCESS AMOUNTS.**—Any payments received under paragraph (2) that are in excess of the actual cost of training provided shall be credited as miscellaneous receipts to the Treasury of the United States.

#### SEC. 2017. ACCESS TO WATER RESOURCE DATA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a program to provide public access to water resources and related water quality data in the custody of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) **DATA.**—Public access under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include, at a minimum, access to data generated in water resources project development and regulation under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344); and

(2) appropriately employ geographic information system technology and linkages to water resource models and analytical techniques.

(c) **PARTNERSHIPS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, in carrying out activities under this section, the Secretary shall develop partnerships, including cooperative agreements, with State, tribal, and local governments and other Federal agencies.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,000,000 for each fiscal year.

#### SEC. 2018. SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with the Act of July 3, 1930 (33 U.S.C. 426), and notwithstanding administrative actions, it is the policy of the United States to promote beach nourishment for the purposes of flood damage reduction and hurricane and storm damage reduction and related research that encourage the protection, restoration, and enhancement of sandy beaches, including beach restoration and periodic beach renourishment for a period of 50 years, on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprises.

(b) **PREFERENCE.**—In carrying out the policy under subsection (a), preference shall be given to—

(1) areas in which there has been a Federal investment of funds for the purposes described in subsection (a); and

(2) areas with respect to which the need for prevention or mitigation of damage to shores and beaches is attributable to Federal navigation projects or other Federal activities.

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Secretary shall apply the policy under subsection (a) to each shore protection and beach renourishment project (including shore protection and beach renourishment projects constructed before the date of enactment of this Act).

#### SEC. 2019. ABILITY TO PAY.

(a) **CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES.**—Section 103(m)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)(2)) is amended by striking “180 days after such date of enactment” and inserting “December 31, 2007”.

(b) **PROJECTS.**—The Secretary shall apply the criteria and procedures referred to in section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)) to the following projects:

(1) **ST. JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MISSOURI.**—The project for flood control, St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4118).

(2) **LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TEXAS.**—The project for flood control, Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4125).

(3) **WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA PROJECTS.**—The projects for flood control authorized by section 581 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790–3791).

#### SEC. 2020. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM AND ESTUARY RESTORATION.

Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330; 110 Stat. 3679) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out a project to restore and protect an aquatic ecosystem or estuary if the Secretary determines that the project—

“(A)(i) will improve the quality of the environment and is in the public interest; or

“(ii) will improve the elements and features of an estuary (as defined in section 103 of the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2902)); and

“(B) is cost-effective.

“(2) **DAM REMOVAL.**—A project under this section may include removal of a dam.”; and

(2) in subsection (e) by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”.

#### SEC. 2021. SMALL FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$55,000,000”.

#### SEC. 2022. SMALL RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.

Section 107(b) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577(b)) is amended by striking “\$4,000,000” and inserting “\$7,000,000”.

#### SEC. 2023. PROTECTION OF HIGHWAYS, BRIDGE APPROACHES, PUBLIC WORKS, AND NONPROFIT PUBLIC SERVICES.

Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r) is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

#### SEC. 2024. MODIFICATION OF PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

Section 1135(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(h)) is amended by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”.

#### SEC. 2025. REMEDIATION OF ABANDONED MINE SITES.

Section 560(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2336(f)) is amended by striking “\$7,500,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”.

#### SEC. 2026. LEASING AUTHORITY.

Section 4 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes”, approved December 22, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 460d), is amended—

(1) by inserting “federally recognized Indian tribes and” before “Federal” the first place it appears;

(2) by inserting “Indian tribes or” after “considerations, to such”; and

(3) by inserting “federally recognized Indian tribe” after “That in any such lease or license to a”.

#### SEC. 2027. FISCAL TRANSPARENCY REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On the third Tuesday of January of each year beginning January 2008, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the expenditures by the Corps for the preceding fiscal year and estimated expenditures by the Corps for the current fiscal year; and

(2) for projects and activities that are not scheduled for completion in the current fiscal year, the estimated expenditures by the Corps necessary in the following fiscal year for each project or activity to maintain the same level of effort being achieved in the current fiscal year.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—In addition to the information described in subsection (a), the report shall contain a detailed accounting of the following information:

(1) With respect to activities carried out with funding provided under the Construction appropriations account for the Secretary, information on—

(A) projects currently under construction, including—

(i) allocations to date;

(ii) the number of years remaining to complete construction;

(iii) the estimated annual Federal cost to maintain that construction schedule; and

(iv) a list of projects the Corps of Engineers expects to complete during the current fiscal year; and

(B) projects for which there is a signed partnership agreement and completed planning, engineering, and design, including—

(i) the number of years the project is expected to require for completion; and

(ii) estimated annual Federal cost to maintain that construction schedule.

(2) With respect to operation and maintenance of the inland and intracoastal waterways identified by section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804)—

(A) the estimated annual cost to maintain each waterway for the authorized reach and at the authorized depth;

(B) the estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance of locks and dams to ensure navigation without interruption; and

(C) the actual expenditures to maintain each waterway.

(3) With respect to activities carried out with funding provided under the Investigations appropriations account for the Secretary—

(A) the number of active studies;

(B) the number of completed studies not yet authorized for construction;

(C) the number of initiated studies; and

(D) the number of studies expected to be completed during the fiscal year.

(4) Funding received and estimates of funds to be received for interagency and international support activities under section 234 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2323a).

(5) Recreation fees and lease payments.

(6) Hydropower and water storage receipts.

(7) Deposits into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(8) Other revenues and fees collected by the Corps of Engineers.

(9) With respect to permit applications and notifications, a list of individual permit applications and nationwide permit notifications, including—

(A) the date on which each permit application is filed;

(B) the date on which each permit application is determined to be complete;

(C) the date on which any permit application is withdrawn; and

(D) the date on which the Corps of Engineers grants or denies each permit.

(10) With respect to projects that are authorized but for which construction is not complete, a list of such projects for which no funds have been allocated for the 5 preceding fiscal years, including, for each project—

(A) the authorization date;

(B) the last allocation date;

(C) the percentage of construction completed;

(D) the estimated cost remaining until completion of the project; and

(E) a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay.

#### SEC. 2028. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 2361 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary may provide assistance through contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants to—

(1) the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, for establishment and operation of the Southeastern Water Resources Institute to study sustainable development and utilization of water resources in the southeastern United States;

(2) Lewis and Clark Community College, Illinois, for the Great Rivers National Research and Education Center (including facilities that have been or will be constructed at one or more locations in the vicinity of the confluence of the Illinois River, the Missouri River, and the Mississippi River), a collaborative effort of Lewis and Clark Community College, the University of Illinois, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences, and other entities, for the study of river ecology, developing watershed and river management strategies, and educating students and the public on river issues; and

(3) the University of Texas at Dallas for support and operation of the International Center for Decision and Risk Analysis to study risk analysis and control methods for transboundary water resources management in the southwestern United States and other international water resources management problems.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out subsection (a)(1) \$2,000,000, to carry out subsection (a)(2) \$2,000,000, and to carry out subsection (a)(3) \$5,000,000.

#### SEC. 2029. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CRITERIA FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF HARBOR DREDGING PROJECTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Insufficient maintenance dredging results in inefficient water transportation and harmful economic consequences.

(2) The estimated dredging backlog at commercial harbors in the Great Lakes alone is 16,000,000 cubic yards.

(3) Approximately two-thirds of all shipping in the United States either starts or finishes at small harbors.

(4) Small harbors often have a greater proportional impact on local economies than do larger harbors.

(5) Performance metrics can be valuable tools in the budget process for water resources projects.

(6) The use of a single performance metric for water resources projects can result in a budget biased against small and rural communities.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the operations and maintenance budget of the Corps of Engineers should reflect the use of all available economic data, rather than a single performance metric.

#### SEC. 2030. INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT AUTHORITY.

Section 234 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2323a) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may engage in activities (including contracting) in support of other Federal agencies, international organizations, or foreign governments to address problems of national significance to the United States.”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “Secretary of State” and inserting “Department of State”; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “\$250,000 for fiscal year 2001” and inserting “\$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2008”; and

(B) by striking “or international organizations” and inserting “, international organizations, or foreign governments”.

#### SEC. 2031. WATER RESOURCES PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES.

(a) NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES PLANNING POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that all water resources projects should reflect national priorities, encourage economic development, and protect the environment by—

(1) seeking to maximize sustainable economic development;

(2) seeking to avoid the unwise use of floodplains and flood-prone areas and minimizing adverse impacts and vulnerabilities in any case in which a floodplain or flood-prone area must be used; and

(3) protecting and restoring the functions of natural systems and mitigating any unavoidable damage to natural systems.

(b) PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES.—

(1) PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “principles and guidelines” means the principles and guidelines contained in the document prepared by the Water Resources Council pursuant to section 103 of the Water Resources Planning Act (42 U.S.C. 1962a–2), entitled “Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies”, and dated March 10, 1983.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue revisions, consistent with paragraph (3), to the principles and guidelines for use by the Secretary in the formulation, evaluation, and implementation of water resources projects.

(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing revisions to the principles and guidelines under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall evaluate the consistency of the principles and guidelines with, and ensure that the principles and guidelines address, the following:

(A) The use of best available economic principles and analytical techniques, including techniques in risk and uncertainty analysis.

(B) The assessment and incorporation of public safety in the formulation of alternatives and recommended plans.

(C) Assessment methods that reflect the value of projects for low-income communities and projects that use nonstructural approaches to water resources development and management.

(D) The assessment and evaluation of the interaction of a project with other water resources projects and programs within a region or watershed.

(E) The use of contemporary water resources paradigms, including integrated water resources management and adaptive management.

(F) Evaluation methods that ensure that water resources projects are justified by public benefits.

(4) CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(A) consult with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Council on Environmental Quality; and

(B) solicit and consider public and expert comments.

(5) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives copies of—

(i) the revisions to the principles and guidelines for use by the Secretary; and

(ii) an explanation of the intent of each revision, how each revision is consistent with this section, and the probable impact of each revision on water resources projects carried out by the Secretary; and

(B) make the revisions to the principles and guidelines for use by the Secretary available to the public, including on the Internet.

(6) EFFECT.—Subject to the requirements of this subsection, the principles and guidelines as revised under this subsection shall apply to water resources projects carried out by the Secretary instead of the principles and guidelines for such projects in effect on the day before date of enactment of this Act.

(7) APPLICABILITY.—After the date of issuance of the revisions to the principles and guidelines, the revisions shall apply—

(A) to all water resources projects carried out by the Secretary, other than projects for which the Secretary has commenced a feasibility study before the date of such issuance;

(B) at the request of a non-Federal interest, to a water resources project for which the Secretary has commenced a feasibility study before the date of such issuance; and

(C) to the reevaluation or modification of a water resources project, other than a reevaluation or modification that has been commenced by the Secretary before the date of such issuance.

(8) EXISTING STUDIES.—Revisions to the principles and guidelines issued under paragraph (2) shall not affect the validity of any completed study of a water resources project.

(9) RECOMMENDATION.—Upon completion of the revisions to the principles and guidelines for use by the Secretary, the Secretary shall make a recommendation to Congress as to the advisability of repealing subsections (a) and (b) of section 80 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–17).

#### SEC. 2032. WATER RESOURCE PRIORITIES REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report describing the

vulnerability of the United States to damage from flooding, including—

- (1) the risk to human life;
- (2) the risk to property; and
- (3) the comparative risks faced by different regions of the United States.

(b) **INCLUSIONS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include—

- (1) an assessment of the extent to which programs in the United States relating to flooding address flood risk reduction priorities;
- (2) the extent to which those programs may be encouraging development and economic activity in flood-prone areas;
- (3) recommendations for improving those programs with respect to reducing and responding to flood risks; and
- (4) proposals for implementing the recommendations.

#### SEC. 2033. PLANNING.

(a) **MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED IN PLANNING.**—Section 904 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2281) is amended—

(1) by striking “Enhancing” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.—Enhancing**”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **ASSESSMENTS.**—For all feasibility reports for water resources projects completed after December 31, 2007, the Secretary shall assess whether—

- “(1) the water resources project and each separable element is cost-effective; and
- “(2) the water resources project complies with Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations) and public policies.”.

(b) **PLANNING PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS.**—The Chief of Engineers—

(1) shall adopt a risk analysis approach to project cost estimates for water resources projects; and

(2) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, shall—

(A) issue procedures for risk analysis for cost estimation for water resources projects; and

(B) submit to Congress a report that includes any recommended amendments to section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280).

(c) **BENCHMARKS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief of Engineers shall establish benchmarks for determining the length of time it should take to conduct a feasibility study for a water resources project and its associated review process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The Chief of Engineers shall use such benchmarks as a management tool to make the feasibility study process more efficient in all districts of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) **BENCHMARK GOALS.**—The Chief of Engineers shall establish, to the extent practicable, under paragraph (1) benchmark goals for completion of feasibility studies for water resources projects generally within 2 years. In the case of feasibility studies that the Chief of Engineers determines may require additional time based on the project type, size, cost, or complexity, the benchmark goal for completion shall be generally within 4 years.

(d) **CALCULATION OF BENEFITS AND COSTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.**—A feasibility study for a project for flood damage reduction shall include, as part of the calculation of benefits and costs—

- (1) a calculation of the residual risk of flooding following completion of the proposed project;
- (2) a calculation of the residual risk of loss of human life and residual risk to human safety following completion of the proposed project;
- (3) a calculation of any upstream or downstream impacts of the proposed project; and
- (4) calculations to ensure that the benefits and costs associated with structural and non-

structural alternatives are evaluated in an equitable manner.

(e) **CENTERS OF SPECIALIZED PLANNING EXPERTISE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary may establish centers of expertise to provide specialized planning expertise for water resources projects to be carried out by the Secretary in order to enhance and supplement the capabilities of the districts of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) **DUTIES.**—A center of expertise established under this subsection shall—

(A) provide technical and managerial assistance to district commanders of the Corps of Engineers for project planning, development, and implementation;

(B) provide agency peer reviews of new major scientific, engineering, or economic methods, models, or analyses that will be used to support decisions of the Secretary with respect to feasibility studies for water resources projects;

(C) provide support for independent peer review panels under section 2034; and

(D) carry out such other duties as are prescribed by the Secretary.

(f) **COMPLETION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS REPORTS.**—

(1) **ALTERNATIVES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Feasibility and other studies and assessments for a water resources project shall include recommendations for alternatives—

(i) that, as determined in coordination with the non-Federal interest for the project, promote integrated water resources management; and

(ii) for which the non-Federal interest is willing to provide the non-Federal share for the studies or assessments.

(B) **CONSTRAINTS.**—The alternatives contained in studies and assessments described in subparagraph (A) shall not be constrained by budgetary or other policy.

(C) **REPORTS OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS.**—The reports of the Chief of Engineers shall identify any recommendation that is not the best technical solution to water resource needs and problems and the reason for the deviation.

(2) **REPORT COMPLETION.**—The completion of a report of the Chief of Engineers for a water resources project—

(A) shall not be delayed while consideration is being given to potential changes in policy or priority for project consideration; and

(B) shall be submitted, on completion, to—

(i) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(g) **COMPLETION REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 120 days after the date of completion of a report of the Chief of Engineers that recommends to Congress a water resources project, the Secretary shall—

(A) review the report; and

(B) provide any recommendations of the Secretary regarding the water resources project to Congress.

(2) **PRIOR REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to any report of the Chief of Engineers recommending a water resources project that is complete prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete review of, and provide recommendations to Congress for, the report in accordance with paragraph (1).

#### SEC. 2034. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.

(a) **PROJECT STUDIES SUBJECT TO INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Project studies shall be subject to a peer review by an independent panel of experts as determined under this section.

(2) **SCOPE.**—The peer review may include a review of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analyses, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alter-

native plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in evaluation of economic or environmental impacts of proposed projects, and any biological opinions of the project study.

(3) **PROJECT STUDIES SUBJECT TO PEER REVIEW.**—

(A) **MANDATORY.**—A project study shall be subject to peer review under paragraph (1) if—

(i) the project has an estimated total cost of more than \$45,000,000, including mitigation costs, and is not determined by the Chief of Engineers to be exempt from peer review under paragraph (6);

(ii) the Governor of an affected State requests a peer review by an independent panel of experts; or

(iii) the Chief of Engineers determines that the project study is controversial considering the factors set forth in paragraph (4).

(B) **DISCRETIONARY.**—

(i) **AGENCY REQUEST.**—A project study shall be considered by the Chief of Engineers for peer review under this section if the head of a Federal or State agency charged with reviewing the project study determines that the project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on environmental, cultural, or other resources under the jurisdiction of the agency after implementation of proposed mitigation plans and requests a peer review by an independent panel of experts.

(ii) **DEADLINE FOR DECISION.**—A decision of the Chief of Engineers under this subparagraph whether to conduct a peer review shall be made within 21 days of the date of receipt of the request by the head of the Federal or State agency under clause (i).

(iii) **REASONS FOR NOT CONDUCTING PEER REVIEW.**—If the Chief of Engineers decides not to conduct a peer review following a request under clause (i), the Chief shall make publicly available, including on the Internet, the reasons for not conducting the peer review.

(iv) **APPEAL TO CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.**—A decision by the Chief of Engineers not to conduct a peer review following a request under clause (i) shall be subject to appeal by a person referred to in clause (i) to the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality if such appeal is made within the 30-day period following the date of the decision being made available under clause (iii). A decision of the Chairman on an appeal under this clause shall be made within 30 days of the date of the appeal.

(4) **FACTORS TO CONSIDER.**—In determining whether a project study is controversial under paragraph (3)(A)(iii), the Chief of Engineers shall consider if—

(A) there is a significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project; or

(B) there is a significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

(5) **PROJECT STUDIES EXCLUDED FROM PEER REVIEW.**—The Chief of Engineers may exclude a project study from peer review under paragraph (1)—

(A) if the project study does not include an environmental impact statement and is a project study subject to peer review under paragraph (3)(A)(i) that the Chief of Engineers determines—

(i) is not controversial;

(ii) has no more than negligible adverse impacts on scarce or unique cultural, historic, or tribal resources;

(iii) has no substantial adverse impacts on fish and wildlife species and their habitat prior to the implementation of mitigation measures; and

(iv) has, before implementation of mitigation measures, no more than a negligible adverse impact on a species listed as endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or the critical habitat of such species designated under such Act;



(b) if the project study—

(i) involves only the rehabilitation or replacement of existing hydropower turbines, lock structures, or flood control gates within the same footprint and for the same purpose as an existing water resources project;

(ii) is for an activity for which there is ample experience within the Corps of Engineers and industry to treat the activity as being routine; and

(iii) has minimal life safety risk; or

(C) if the project study does not include an environmental impact statement and is a project study pursued under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937 (33 U.S.C. 701g), section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), section 107(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577(a)), section 3 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g), section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i), section 3 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a), section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), or section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

(6) DETERMINATION OF TOTAL COST.—For purposes of determining the estimated total cost of a project under paragraph (3)(A), the total cost shall be based upon the reasonable estimates of the Chief of Engineers at the completion of the reconnaissance study for the project. If the reasonable estimate of total costs is subsequently determined to be in excess of the amount in paragraph (3)(A), the Chief of Engineers shall make a determination whether a project study is required to be reviewed under this section.

(b) TIMING OF PEER REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of Engineers shall determine the timing of a peer review of a project study under subsection (a). In all cases, the peer review shall occur during the period beginning on the date of the signing of the feasibility cost-sharing agreement for the study and ending on the date established under subsection (e)(1)(A) for the peer review and shall be accomplished concurrent with the conducting of the project study.

(2) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—In any case in which the Chief of Engineers has not initiated a peer review of a project study, the Chief of Engineers shall consider, at a minimum, whether to initiate a peer review at the time that—

(A) the without-project conditions are identical;

(B) the array of alternatives to be considered are identified; and

(C) the preferred alternative is identified.

(3) LIMITATION ON MULTIPLE PEER REVIEW.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require the Chief of Engineers to conduct multiple peer reviews for a project study.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF PANELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each project study subject to peer review under subsection (a), as soon as practicable after the Chief of Engineers determines that a project study will be subject to peer review, the Chief of Engineers shall contract with the National Academy of Sciences or a similar independent scientific and technical advisory organization or an eligible organization to establish a panel of experts to conduct a peer review for the project study.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—A panel of experts established for a project study under this section shall be composed of independent experts who represent a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted.

(3) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENTS.—The National Academy of Sciences or any other organization the Chief of Engineers contracts with

under paragraph (1) to establish a panel of experts shall apply the National Academy of Science's policy for selecting committee members to ensure that members selected for the panel of experts have no conflict with the project being reviewed.

(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Upon identification of a project study for peer review under this section, but prior to initiation of the review, the Chief of Engineers shall notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the review.

(d) DUTIES OF PANELS.—A panel of experts established for a peer review for a project study under this section shall—

(1) conduct the peer review for the project study;

(2) assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering, and environmental methods, models, and analyses used by the Chief of Engineers;

(3) receive from the Chief of Engineers the public written and oral comments provided to the Chief of Engineers;

(4) provide timely written and oral comments to the Chief of Engineers throughout the development of the project study, as requested; and

(5) submit to the Chief of Engineers a final report containing the panel's economic, engineering, and environmental analysis of the project study, including the panel's assessment of the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering, and environmental methods, models, and analyses used by the Chief of Engineers, to accompany the publication of the report of the Chief of Engineers for the project.

(e) DURATION OF PROJECT STUDY PEER REVIEWS.—

(1) DEADLINE.—A panel of experts established under this section shall—

(A) complete its peer review under this section for a project study and submit a report to the Chief of Engineers under subsection (d)(5) not more than 60 days after the last day of the public comment period for the draft project study, or, if the Chief of Engineers determines that a longer period of time is necessary, such period of time determined necessary by the Chief of Engineers; and

(B) terminate on the date of initiation of the State and agency review required by the first section of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

(2) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—If a panel of experts does not complete its peer review of a project study under this section and submit a report to the Chief of Engineers under subsection (d)(5) on or before the deadline established by paragraph (1) for the peer review, the Chief of Engineers shall complete the project study without delay.

(f) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—

(1) CONSIDERATION BY THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS.—After receiving a report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section and before entering a final record of decision for the project, the Chief of Engineers shall consider any recommendations contained in the report and prepare a written response for any recommendations adopted or not adopted.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—After receiving a report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section, the Chief of Engineers shall—

(A) make a copy of the report and any written response of the Chief of Engineers on recommendations contained in the report available to the public by electronic means, including the Internet; and

(B) transmit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a copy of the report, together with any such written response, on the date of a final report of the Chief of Engineers or other final decision document for the project study.

(g) COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The costs of a panel of experts established for a peer review under this section—

(A) shall be a Federal expense; and

(B) shall not exceed \$500,000.

(2) WAIVER.—The Chief of Engineers may waive the \$500,000 limitation contained in paragraph (1)(B) in cases that the Chief of Engineers determines appropriate.

(h) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to—

(1) project studies initiated during the 2-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act and for which the array of alternatives to be considered has not been identified; and

(2) project studies initiated during the period beginning on such date of enactment and ending 7 years after such date of enactment.

(i) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of this section.

(2) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Chief of Engineers shall update the report under paragraph (1) taking into account any further information on implementation of this section and submit such updated report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(j) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACAs.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to a peer review panel established under this section.

(k) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any authority of the Chief of Engineers to cause or conduct a peer review of a water resources project existing on the date of enactment of this section.

(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) PROJECT STUDY.—The term “project study” means—

(A) a feasibility study or reevaluation study for a water resources project, including the environmental impact statement prepared for the study; and

(B) any other study associated with a modification of a water resources project that includes an environmental impact statement, including the environmental impact statement prepared for the study.

(2) AFFECTED STATE.—The term “affected State”, as used with respect to a water resources project, means a State all or a portion of which is within the drainage basin in which the project is or would be located and would be economically or environmentally affected as a consequence of the project.

(3) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATION.—The term “eligible organization” means an organization that—

(A) is described in section 501(c)(3), and exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(B) is independent;

(C) is free from conflicts of interest;

(D) does not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water resources projects; and

(E) has experience in establishing and administering peer review panels.

(4) TOTAL COST.—The term “total cost”, as used with respect to a water resources project, means the cost of construction (including planning and designing) of the project. In the case of a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction or flood damage reduction that includes periodic nourishment over the life of the project, the term includes the total cost of the nourishment.

#### SEC. 2035. SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW.

(a) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW.—The Chief of Engineers shall ensure



that the design and construction activities for hurricane and storm damage reduction and flood damage reduction projects are reviewed by independent experts under this section if the Chief of Engineers determines that a review by independent experts is necessary to assure public health, safety, and welfare.

(b) **FACTORS.**—In determining whether a review of design and construction of a project is necessary under this section, the Chief of Engineers shall consider whether—

(1) the failure of the project would pose a significant threat to human life;

(2) the project involves the use of innovative materials or techniques;

(3) the project design lacks redundancy; or

(4) the project has a unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

(c) **SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW.**—

(1) **INITIATION OF REVIEW.**—At the appropriate point in the development of detailed engineering and design specifications for each water resources project subject to review under this section, the Chief of Engineers shall initiate a safety assurance review by independent experts on the design and construction activities for the project.

(2) **SELECTION OF REVIEWERS.**—A safety assurance review under this section shall include participation by experts selected by the Chief of Engineers from among individuals who are distinguished experts in engineering, hydrology, or other appropriate disciplines. The Chief of Engineers shall apply the National Academy of Science's policy for selecting reviewers to ensure that reviewers have no conflict of interest with the project being reviewed.

(3) **COMPENSATION.**—An individual serving as an independent reviewer under this section shall be compensated at a rate of pay to be determined by the Secretary and shall be allowed travel expenses.

(d) **SCOPE OF SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEWS.**—A safety assurance review under this section shall include a review of the design and construction activities prior to the initiation of physical construction and periodically thereafter until construction activities are completed on a regular schedule sufficient to inform the Chief of Engineers on the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities for the purpose of assuring public health, safety, and welfare. The Chief of Engineers shall ensure that reviews under this section do not create any unnecessary delays in design and construction activities.

(e) **SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW RECORD.**—The written recommendations of a reviewer or panel of reviewers under this section and the responses of the Chief of Engineers shall be available to the public, including through electronic means on the Internet.

(f) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section shall apply to any project in design or under construction on the date of enactment of this Act and to any project with respect to which design or construction is initiated during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending 7 years after such date of enactment.

#### **SEC. 2036. MITIGATION FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE AND WETLANDS LOSSES.**

(a) **MITIGATION FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE LOSSES.**—Section 906(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1) by striking “to the Congress” and inserting “to Congress in any report, and shall not select a project alternative in any report.”;

(2) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) by inserting “, and other habitat types are mitigated to not less than in-kind conditions” after “mitigated in-kind”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—To mitigate losses to flood damage reduction capabilities and fish and

wildlife resulting from a water resources project, the Secretary shall ensure that the mitigation plan for each water resources project complies with the mitigation standards and policies established pursuant to the regulatory programs administered by the Secretary.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—A specific mitigation plan for a water resources project under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum—

“(i) a plan for monitoring the implementation and ecological success of each mitigation measure, including the cost and duration of any monitoring, and, to the extent practicable, a designation of the entities that will be responsible for the monitoring;

“(ii) the criteria for ecological success by which the mitigation will be evaluated and determined to be successful based on replacement of lost functions and values of the habitat, including hydrologic and vegetative characteristics;

“(iii) a description of the land and interests in land to be acquired for the mitigation plan and the basis for a determination that the land and interests are available for acquisition;

“(iv) a description of—

“(I) the types and amount of restoration activities to be conducted;

“(II) the physical action to be undertaken to achieve the mitigation objectives within the watershed in which such losses occur and, in any case in which the mitigation will occur outside the watershed, a detailed explanation for undertaking the mitigation outside the watershed; and

“(III) the functions and values that will result from the mitigation plan; and

“(v) a contingency plan for taking corrective actions in cases in which monitoring demonstrates that mitigation measures are not achieving ecological success in accordance with criteria under clause (ii).

“(C) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR MONITORING.**—In any case in which it is not practicable to identify in a mitigation plan for a water resources project the entity responsible for monitoring at the time of a final report of the Chief of Engineers or other final decision document for the project, such entity shall be identified in the partnership agreement entered into with the non-Federal interest under section 221 of Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

“(4) **DETERMINATION OF SUCCESS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A mitigation plan under this subsection shall be considered to be successful at the time at which the criteria under paragraph (3)(B)(ii) are achieved under the plan, as determined by monitoring under paragraph (3)(B)(i).

“(B) **CONSULTATION.**—In determining whether a mitigation plan is successful under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult annually with appropriate Federal agencies and each State in which the applicable project is located on at least the following:

“(i) The ecological success of the mitigation as of the date on which the report is submitted.

“(ii) The likelihood that the mitigation will achieve ecological success, as defined in the mitigation plan.

“(iii) The projected timeline for achieving that success.

“(iv) Any recommendations for improving the likelihood of success.

“(5) **MONITORING.**—Mitigation monitoring shall continue until it has been demonstrated that the mitigation has met the ecological success criteria.”.

(b) **STATUS REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Concurrent with the President's submission to Congress of the President's request for appropriations for the Civil Works Program for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of construction of projects that require mitigation

under section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283), the status of such mitigation, and the results of the consultation under subsection (d)(4)(B) of such section.

(2) **PROJECTS INCLUDED.**—The status report shall include the status of—

(A) all projects that are under construction as of the date of the report;

(B) all projects for which the President requests funding for the next fiscal year; and

(C) all projects that have undergone or completed construction, but have not completed the mitigation required under section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

(3) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall make information contained in the status report available to the public, including on the Internet.

(c) **WETLANDS MITIGATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out a water resources project that involves wetlands mitigation and that has impacts that occur within the service area of a mitigation bank, the Secretary, where appropriate, shall first consider the use of the mitigation bank if the bank contains sufficient available credits to offset the impact and the bank is approved in accordance with the Federal Guidance for the Establishment, Use and Operation of Mitigation Banks (60 Fed. Reg. 58605) or other applicable Federal law (including regulations).

(2) **SERVICE AREA.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the service area of the mitigation bank under paragraph (1) shall be in the same watershed as the affected habitat.

(3) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR MONITORING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Purchase of credits from a mitigation bank for a water resources project relieves the Secretary and the non-Federal interest from responsibility for monitoring or demonstrating mitigation success.

(B) **APPLICABILITY.**—The relief of responsibility under subparagraph (A) applies only in any case in which the Secretary determines that monitoring of mitigation success is being conducted by the Secretary or by the owner or operator of the mitigation bank.

#### **SEC. 2037. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) is amended to read as follows:

##### **“SEC. 204. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(1) **SEDIMENT USE.**—For sediment obtained through the construction, operation, or maintenance of an authorized Federal water resources project, the Secretary shall develop, at Federal expense, regional sediment management plans and carry out projects at locations identified in plans developed under this section, or identified jointly by the non-Federal interest and the Secretary, for use in the construction, repair, modification, or rehabilitation of projects associated with Federal water resources projects for purposes listed in paragraph (3).

“(2) **COOPERATION.**—The Secretary shall develop plans under this subsection in cooperation with the appropriate Federal, State, regional, and local agencies.

“(3) **PURPOSES FOR SEDIMENT USE IN PROJECTS.**—The purposes of using sediment for the construction, repair, modification, or rehabilitation of Federal water resources projects are—

“(A) to reduce storm damage to property;

“(B) to protect, restore, and create aquatic and ecologically related habitats, including wetlands; and

“(C) to transport and place suitable sediment.

“(b) **SECRETARIAL FINDINGS.**—Subject to subsection (c), projects carried out under subsection (a) may be carried out in any case in which the Secretary finds that—

“(1) the environmental, economic, and social benefits of the project, both monetary and non-monetary, justify the cost of the project; and

“(2) the project will not result in environmental degradation.

“(c) DETERMINATION OF PROJECT COSTS.—

“(1) COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Costs associated with construction of a project under this section or identified in a regional sediment management plan shall be limited solely to construction costs that are in excess of the costs necessary to carry out the dredging for construction, operation, or maintenance of an authorized Federal water resources project in the most cost-effective way, consistent with economic, engineering, and environmental criteria.

“(B) COST SHARING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the non-Federal share of the construction cost of a project under this section shall be determined as provided in subsections (a) through (d) of section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—Construction of a project under this section for one or more of the purposes of protection, restoration, or creation of aquatic and ecologically related habitat, the cost of which does not exceed \$750,000 and which is located in a disadvantaged community as determined by the Secretary, may be carried out at Federal expense.

“(C) TOTAL COST.—The total Federal costs associated with construction of a project under this section may not exceed \$5,000,000.

“(2) OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, REPLACEMENT, AND REHABILITATION COSTS.—Operation, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation costs associated with a project under this section are the responsibility of the non-Federal interest.

“(d) SELECTION OF DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL METHOD FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PURPOSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing and carrying out a Federal water resources project involving the disposal of dredged material, the Secretary may select, with the consent of the non-Federal interest, a disposal method that is not the least cost option if the Secretary determines that the incremental costs of the disposal method are reasonable in relation to the environmental benefits, including the benefits to the aquatic environment to be derived from the creation of wetlands and control of shoreline erosion.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of such incremental costs shall be determined in accordance with subsection (c).

“(e) STATE AND REGIONAL PLANS.—The Secretary may—

“(1) cooperate with any State in the preparation of a comprehensive State or regional sediment management plan within the boundaries of the State;

“(2) encourage State participation in the implementation of the plan; and

“(3) submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate Federal participation in carrying out the plan.

“(f) PRIORITY AREAS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall give priority to a regional sediment management project in the vicinity of each of the following:

“(1) Little Rock Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas.

“(2) Fletcher Cove, California.

“(3) Egmont Key, Florida.

“(4) Calcasieu Ship Channel, Louisiana.

“(5) Delaware River Estuary, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

“(6) Fire Island Inlet, Suffolk County, New York.

“(7) Smith Point Park Pavilion and the TWA Flight 800 Memorial, Brookhaven, New York.

“(8) Morehead City, North Carolina.

“(9) Toledo Harbor, Lucas County, Ohio.

“(10) Galveston Bay, Texas.

“(11) Benson Beach, Washington.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000 per fiscal year, of which not more than \$5,000,000 per fiscal year may be used for the development of regional sediment management plans authorized by sub-

section (e) and of which not more than \$3,000,000 per fiscal year may be used for construction of projects to which subsection (c)(1)(B)(ii) applies. Such funds shall remain available until expended.”.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 145 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 426j) is repealed.

(2) EXISTING PROJECTS.—The Secretary may complete any project being carried out under section 145 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 2038. NATIONAL SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 3. STORM AND HURRICANE RESTORATION AND IMPACT MINIMIZATION PROGRAM.

“(a) CONSTRUCTION OF SMALL SHORE AND BEACH RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a program for the construction of small shore and beach restoration and protection projects not specifically authorized by Congress that otherwise comply with the first section of this Act if the Secretary determines that such construction is advisable.

“(2) LOCAL COOPERATION.—The local cooperation requirement of the first section of this Act shall apply to a project under this section.

“(3) COMPLETENESS.—A project under this subsection—

“(A) shall be complete; and

“(B) shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to ensure the successful operation of the project; except for participation in periodic beach nourishment in accordance with—

“(i) the first section of this Act; and

“(ii) the procedure for projects authorized after submission of a survey report.

“(b) NATIONAL SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct under the program authorized by subsection (a) a national shoreline erosion control development and demonstration program (referred to in this section as the ‘demonstration program’).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The demonstration program shall include provisions for—

“(i) projects consisting of planning, design, construction, and monitoring of prototype engineered and native and naturalized vegetative shoreline erosion control devices and methods;

“(ii) monitoring of the applicable prototypes;

“(iii) detailed engineering and environmental reports on the results of each project carried out under the demonstration program; and

“(iv) technology transfers, as appropriate, to private property owners, State and local entities, nonprofit educational institutions, and nongovernmental organizations.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF FEASIBILITY.—A project under the demonstration program shall not be carried out until the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

“(C) EMPHASIS.—A project under the demonstration program shall emphasize, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(i) the development and demonstration of innovative technologies;

“(ii) efficient designs to prevent erosion at a shoreline site, taking into account the lifecycle cost of the design, including cleanup, maintenance, and amortization;

“(iii) new and enhanced shore protection project design and project formulation tools the purposes of which are to improve the physical

performance, and lower the lifecycle costs, of the projects;

“(iv) natural designs, including the use of native and naturalized vegetation or temporary structures that minimize permanent structural alterations to the shoreline;

“(v) the avoidance of negative impacts to adjacent shorefront communities;

“(vi) in areas with substantial residential or commercial interests located adjacent to the shoreline, designs that do not impair the aesthetic appeal of the interests;

“(vii) the potential for long-term protection afforded by the technology; and

“(viii) recommendations developed from evaluations of the program established under the Shoreline Erosion Control Demonstration Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962-5 note), including—

“(I) adequate consideration of the subgrade;

“(II) proper filtration;

“(III) durable components;

“(IV) adequate connection between units; and

“(V) consideration of additional relevant information.

“(D) SITES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each project under the demonstration program may be carried out at—

“(I) a privately owned site with substantial public access; or

“(II) a publicly owned site on open coast or in tidal waters.

“(ii) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall develop criteria for the selection of sites for projects under the demonstration program, including criteria based on—

“(I) a variety of geographic and climatic conditions;

“(II) the size of the population that is dependent on the beaches for recreation or the protection of private property or public infrastructure;

“(III) the rate of erosion;

“(IV) significant natural resources or habitats and environmentally sensitive areas; and

“(V) significant threatened historic structures or landmarks.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the demonstration program in consultation with—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly with respect to native and naturalized vegetative means of preventing and controlling shoreline erosion;

“(B) Federal, State, and local agencies;

“(C) private organizations;

“(D) the Coastal Engineering Research Center established by the first section of Public Law 88-172 (33 U.S.C. 426-1); and

“(E) applicable university research facilities.

“(4) COMPLETION OF DEMONSTRATION.—After carrying out the initial construction and evaluation of the performance and cost of a project under the demonstration program, the Secretary may—

“(A) amend, at the request of a non-Federal interest of the project, the partnership agreement for a federally authorized shore protection project in existence on the date on which initial construction of the project under the demonstration program is complete to incorporate the project constructed under the demonstration program as a feature of the shore protection project, with the future cost sharing of the project constructed under the demonstration program to be determined by the project purposes of the shore protection project; or

“(B) transfer all interest in and responsibility for the completed project constructed under the demonstration program to a non-Federal interest or another Federal agency.

“(5) AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into a partnership agreement with the non-Federal interest or a cooperative agreement with the head of another Federal agency under the demonstration program—

“(A) to share the costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and monitoring of a project under the demonstration program;

“(B) to share the costs of removing the project, or element of the project if the Secretary

determines that the project or element of the project is detrimental to public or private property, public infrastructure, or public safety; or

“(C) to specify ownership of the completed project if the Secretary determines that the completed project will not be part of a Corps of Engineers project.

“(6) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2008, and every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing—

“(A) the activities carried out and accomplishments made under the demonstration program since the previous report under this paragraph; and

“(B) any recommendations of the Secretary relating to the program.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may expend, from any appropriations made available to the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out civil works, not more than \$30,000,000 during any fiscal year to pay the Federal share of the costs of construction of small shore and beach restoration and protection projects or small projects under this section.

“(2) LIMITATION.—The total amount expended for a project under this section shall—

“(A) be sufficient to pay the cost of Federal participation in the project (including periodic nourishment as provided for under the first section of this Act), as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) be not more than \$5,000,000.”

(b) REPEAL.—Section 5 the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426h), is repealed.

#### SEC. 2039. MONITORING ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In conducting a feasibility study for a project (or a component of a project) for ecosystem restoration, the Secretary shall ensure that the recommended project includes, as an integral part of the project, a plan for monitoring the success of the ecosystem restoration.

(b) MONITORING PLAN.—The monitoring plan shall—

(1) include a description of the monitoring activities to be carried out, the criteria for ecosystem restoration success, and the estimated cost and duration of the monitoring; and

(2) specify that the monitoring shall continue until such time as the Secretary determines that the criteria for ecosystem restoration success will be met.

(c) COST SHARE.—For a period of 10 years from completion of construction of a project (or a component of a project) for ecosystem restoration, the Secretary shall consider the cost of carrying out the monitoring as a project cost. If the monitoring plan under subsection (b) requires monitoring beyond the 10-year period, the cost of monitoring shall be a non-Federal responsibility.

#### SEC. 2040. ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program to allow electronic submission of permit applications for permits under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—This section does not preclude the submission of a physical copy.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,000,000.

#### SEC. 2041. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION.

(a) PROJECT TRACKING.—The Secretary shall assign a unique tracking number to each water resources project under the jurisdiction of the Secretary to be used by each Federal agency throughout the life of the project.

(b) REPORT REPOSITORY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to the Library of Congress a copy of each final feasibility study, final environmental impact statement, final reevaluation report, record of decision, and report to Congress prepared by the Corps of Engineers.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—Each document described in paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public, and an electronic copy of each document shall be made permanently available to the public through the Internet.

#### SEC. 2042. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.

Sections 101, 106, and 108 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–103; 119 Stat. 2252–2254), are repealed.

#### SEC. 2043. STUDIES AND REPORTS FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS.

(a) STUDIES.—

(1) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 105(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) DETAILED PROJECT REPORTS.—The requirements of this subsection that apply to a feasibility study also shall apply to a study that results in a detailed project report, except that—

“(A) the first \$100,000 of the costs of a study that results in a detailed project report shall be a Federal expense; and

“(B) paragraph (1)(C)(ii) shall not apply to such a study.”

(2) PLANNING AND ENGINEERING.—Section 105(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2215(b)) is amended by striking “authorized by this Act”.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 105 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2215) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) DETAILED PROJECT REPORT.—The term ‘detailed project report’ means a report for a project not specifically authorized by Congress in law or otherwise that determines the feasibility of the project with a level of detail appropriate to the scope and complexity of the recommended solution and sufficient to proceed directly to the preparation of contract plans and specifications. The term includes any associated environmental impact statement and mitigation plan. For a project for which the Federal cost does not exceed \$1,000,000, the term includes a planning and design analysis document.

“(2) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The term ‘feasibility study’ means a study that results in a feasibility report under section 905, and any associated environmental impact statement and mitigation plan, prepared by the Corps of Engineers for a water resources project. The term includes a study that results in a project implementation report prepared under title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680–2694), a general reevaluation report, and a limited reevaluation report.”

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) PREPARATION.—Section 905(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) In the case of any” and inserting the following:

“(a) PREPARATION OF REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any”;

(B) by striking “the Secretary, the Secretary shall” and inserting “the Secretary that results in recommendations concerning a project or the operation of a project and that requires specific authorization by Congress in law or otherwise, the Secretary shall perform a reconnaissance study and”;

(C) by striking “Such feasibility report” and inserting the following:

“(2) CONTENTS OF FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—A feasibility report”;

(D) by striking “The feasibility report” and inserting “A feasibility report”;

(E) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

“(3) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection shall not apply to—

“(A) any study with respect to which a report has been submitted to Congress before the date of enactment of this Act;

“(B) any study for a project, which project is authorized for construction by this Act and is not subject to section 903(b);

“(C) any study for a project which does not require specific authorization by Congress in law or otherwise; and

“(D) general studies not intended to lead to recommendation of a specific water resources project.

“(4) FEASIBILITY REPORT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘feasibility report’ means each feasibility report, and any associated environmental impact statement and mitigation plan, prepared by the Corps of Engineers for a water resources project. The term includes a project implementation report prepared under title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680–2694), a general reevaluation report, and a limited reevaluation report.”

(2) PROJECTS NOT SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS.—Section 905 of such Act is further amended—

(A) in subsection (b) by inserting “RECONNAISSANCE STUDIES.—” before “Before initiating”;

(B) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PROJECTS NOT SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS.—In the case of any water resources project-related study authorized to be undertaken by the Secretary without specific authorization by Congress in law or otherwise, the Secretary shall prepare a detailed project report.”

(D) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated) by inserting “INDIAN TRIBES.—” before “For purposes of”;

(E) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated) by inserting “STANDARD AND UNIFORM PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES.—” before “The Secretary shall”.

#### SEC. 2044. COORDINATION AND SCHEDULING OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ACTIONS.

(a) NOTICE OF INTENT.—Upon request of the non-Federal interest in the form of a written notice of intent to construct or modify a non-Federal water supply, wastewater infrastructure, flood damage reduction, storm damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, or navigation project that requires the approval of the Secretary, the Secretary shall initiate, subject to subsection (c), procedures to establish a schedule for consolidating Federal, State, and local agency and Indian tribe environmental assessments, project reviews, and issuance of all permits for the construction or modification of the project. All States and Indian tribes having jurisdiction over the proposed project shall be invited by the Secretary, but shall not be required, to participate in carrying out this section with respect to the project.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall seek, to the extent practicable, to consolidate hearing and comment periods, procedures for data collection and report preparation, and the environmental review and permitting processes associated with the project and related activities. The Secretary shall notify, to the extent possible, the non-Federal interest of its responsibilities for data development and information that may be necessary to process each permit required for the project, including a schedule when the information and data should be provided to the appropriate Federal, State, or local agency or Indian tribe.

(c) COSTS OF COORDINATION.—The costs incurred by the Secretary to establish and carry out a schedule to consolidate Federal, State, and local agency and Indian tribe environmental assessments, project reviews, and permit issuance for a project under this section shall be paid by the non-Federal interest.

(d) **REPORT ON TIMESAVINGS METHODS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report estimating the time required for the issuance of all Federal, State, local, and tribal permits for the construction of non-Federal projects for water supply, wastewater infrastructure, flood damage reduction, storm damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and navigation.

#### SEC. 2045. PROJECT STREAMLINING.

(a) **POLICY.**—The benefits of water resources projects are important to the Nation's economy and environment, and recommendations to Congress regarding such projects should not be delayed due to uncoordinated or inefficient reviews or the failure to timely resolve disputes during the development of water resources projects.

(b) **SCOPE.**—This section shall apply to each study initiated after the date of enactment of this Act to develop a feasibility report under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), or a reevaluation report, for a water resources project if the Secretary determines that such study requires an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(c) **WATER RESOURCES PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS.**—The Secretary shall develop and implement a coordinated review process for the development of water resources projects.

(d) **COORDINATED REVIEWS.**—The coordinated review process under this section may provide that all reviews, analyses, opinions, permits, licenses, and approvals that must be issued or made by a Federal, State, or local government agency or Indian tribe for the development of a water resources project described in subsection (b) will be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, concurrently and completed within a time period established by the Secretary in cooperation with the agencies identified under subsection (e) with respect to the project.

(e) **IDENTIFICATION OF JURISDICTIONAL AGENCIES.**—With respect to the development of each water resources project, the Secretary shall identify, as soon as practicable, all Federal, State, and local government agencies and Indian tribes that may—

- (1) have jurisdiction over the project;
- (2) be required by law to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the project; or
- (3) be required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the project.

(f) **STATE AUTHORITY.**—If the coordinated review process is being implemented under this section by the Secretary with respect to the development of a water resources project described in subsection (b) within the boundaries of a State, the State, consistent with State law, may choose to participate in the process and to make subject to the process all State agencies that—

- (1) have jurisdiction over the project;
- (2) are required to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the project; or
- (3) are required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the project.

(g) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The coordinated review process developed under this section may be incorporated into a memorandum of understanding for a water resources project between the Secretary, the heads of Federal, State, and local government agencies, Indian tribes identified under subsection (e), and the non-Federal interest for the project.

(h) **EFFECT OF FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.**—

(1) **NOTIFICATION.**—If the Secretary determines that a Federal, State, or local government agency, Indian tribe, or non-Federal interest that is participating in the coordinated review process under this section with respect to the development of a water resources project has not met a deadline established under subsection (d) for the

project, the Secretary shall notify, within 30 days of the date of such determination, the agency, Indian tribe, or non-Federal interest about the failure to meet the deadline.

(2) **AGENCY REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notice under paragraph (1), the Federal, State, or local government agency, Indian tribe, or non-Federal interest involved may submit a report to the Secretary, explaining why the agency, Indian tribe, or non-Federal interest did not meet the deadline and what actions it intends to take to complete or issue the required review, analysis, or opinion or determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval.

(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a report under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall compile and submit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Council on Environmental Quality, describing any deadlines identified in paragraph (1), and any information provided to the Secretary by the Federal, State, or local government agency, Indian tribe, or non-Federal interest involved under paragraph (2).

(i) **LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in this section shall preempt or interfere with—

- (1) any statutory requirement for seeking public comment;
- (2) any power, jurisdiction, or authority that a Federal, State, or local government agency, Indian tribe, or non-Federal interest has with respect to carrying out a water resources project; or
- (3) any obligation to comply with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality to carry out such Act.

#### SEC. 2046. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATION.

Section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)) is amended—

- (1) in the first sentence—
- (A) by striking “two years” and inserting “year”; and
- (B) by striking “7” and inserting “5”;
- (2) in the last sentence by striking “30 months after the date” and inserting “the last date of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which”; and
- (3) in the last sentence by striking “such 30 month period” and inserting “such period”.

#### SEC. 2047. FEDERAL HOPPER DREDGES.

(a) **HOPPER DREDGE MCFARLAND.**—Section 563 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3784) is amended to read as follows:

##### “SEC. 563. HOPPER DREDGE MCFARLAND.

“(a) **PLACEMENT IN READY RESERVE STATUS.**—Not before October 1, 2009, and not after December 31, 2009, the Secretary shall—

- “(1) place the Federal hopper dredge McFarland (referred to in this section as the ‘vessel’) in a ready reserve status; and
- “(2) use the vessel solely for urgent and emergency purposes in accordance with existing emergency response protocols.

“(b) **ROUTINE TESTS AND MAINTENANCE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall periodically perform routine underway dredging tests of the equipment (not to exceed 70 days per year) of the vessel in a ready reserve status to ensure the ability of the vessel to perform urgent and emergency work.

“(2) **MAINTENANCE.**—The Secretary—

- “(A) shall not assign any scheduled hopper dredging work to the vessel other than dredging tests in the Delaware River and Bay; but
- “(B) shall perform any repairs, including any asbestos abatement, necessary to maintain the vessel in a ready reserve fully operational condition.

“(c) **ACTIVE STATUS FOR DREDGING.**—The Secretary, in consultation with affected stake-

holders, shall place the vessel in active status in order to perform dredging work if the Secretary determines that private industry has failed—

- “(1) to submit a responsive and responsible bid for work advertised by the Secretary; or
- “(2) to carry out a project as required pursuant to a contract between the industry and the Secretary.”.

(b) **HOPPER DREDGES ESSAYONS AND YAQUINA.**—Section 3(c)(7)(B) of the Act of August 11, 1888 (33 U.S.C. 622; 25 Stat. 423), is amended by adding at the end the following: “This subparagraph shall not apply to the Federal hopper dredges Essayons and Yaquina of the Corps of Engineers.”.

### TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

#### SEC. 3001. BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, ALABAMA.

Section 111 of title I of division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (118 Stat. 2944) is amended to read as follows:

##### “SEC. 111. BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, ALABAMA.

“(a) **CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

“(A) **EXISTING FACILITY.**—The term ‘existing facility’ means the administrative and maintenance facility for the project for Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of July 5, 1884 (24 Stat. 141), in existence on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

“(B) **PARCEL.**—The term ‘Parcel’ means the land owned by the Corps of Engineers serving as the operations and maintenance facility of the Corps of Engineers in the city of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in existence on the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

“(2) **AUTHORIZATION.**—In carrying out the project for Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, the Secretary is authorized, at Federal expense—

“(A) to purchase land on which the Secretary may construct a new maintenance facility for the project, to be located—

- “(i) at a different location from the existing facility; and
- “(ii) in the vicinity of the city of Tuscaloosa, Alabama;

“(B) at any time during or after the completion of (and relocation to) the new maintenance facility, to demolish the existing facility; and

“(C) to construct on the Parcel a new administrative facility for the project.

“(b) **ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.**—The Secretary—

“(1) may acquire any real property necessary for the construction of the new maintenance facility under subsection (a)(2)(A); and

“(2) shall convey to the city of Tuscaloosa fee simple title in and to any portion of the Parcel not required for construction of the new administrative facility under subsection (a)(2)(C) through—

- “(A) sale at fair market value;
- “(B) exchange for city of Tuscaloosa owned land on an acre-for-acre basis; or
- “(C) any combination of a sale under subparagraph (A) and an exchange under subparagraph (B).

“(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$32,000,000.”.

#### SEC. 3002. COOK INLET, ALASKA.

Section 118(a)(3) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (title I of division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005; 118 Stat. 2945) is amended by inserting “as part of the operation and maintenance of such project modification” after “by the Secretary”.

#### SEC. 3003. KING COVE HARBOR, ALASKA.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for navigation, King Cove Harbor, Alaska, being carried out

under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), shall be \$3,000,000.

**SEC. 3004. SEWARD HARBOR, ALASKA.**

The project for navigation, Seward Harbor, Alaska, authorized by section 101(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 274), is modified to authorize the Secretary to extend the existing breakwater by approximately 215 feet, at a total cost of \$3,333,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,666,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$667,000.

**SEC. 3005. SITKA, ALASKA.**

The Sitka, Alaska, element of the project for navigation, Southeast Alaska Harbors of Refuge, Alaska, authorized by section 101(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4801), is modified to direct the Secretary to take such action as is necessary to correct design deficiencies in the Sitka Harbor Breakwater at Federal expense. The estimated cost is \$6,300,000.

**SEC. 3006. TATITLEK, ALASKA.**

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for navigation, Tatitlek, Alaska, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), shall be \$10,000,000.

**SEC. 3007. RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA.**

The project for flood damage reduction, Rio De Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2576), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$54,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$35,000,000 and a non-Federal cost of \$19,100,000.

**SEC. 3008. NOGALES WASH AND TRIBUTARIES FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, ARIZONA.**

The project for flood control, Nogales Wash and tributaries, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606) and modified by section 303 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3711) and section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2600), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$25,410,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$22,930,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,480,000.

**SEC. 3009. TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, ARIZONA.**

The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreation, Tucson drainage area, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 274), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$66,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$43,350,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$23,350,000.

**SEC. 3010. OSCEOLA HARBOR, ARKANSAS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Osceola Harbor, Arkansas, constructed under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), is modified to allow non-Federal interests to construct a mooring facility within the existing authorized harbor channel, subject to all necessary permits, certifications, and other requirements.

(b) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibility of the Secretary to maintain the general navigation features of the project at a bottom width of 250 feet.

**SEC. 3011. ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, ARKANSAS AND MISSOURI.**

The project for flood control, St. Francis River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, authorized by the Act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1508), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake channel stabilization and sediment removal measures on the St. Francis River and tributaries as a nonseparable element of the original project.

**SEC. 3012. PINE MOUNTAIN DAM, ARKANSAS.**

The Pine Mountain Dam feature of the project for flood protection, Lee Creek, Arkansas

and Oklahoma, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1078), is modified—

(1) to add environmental restoration as a project purpose; and

(2) to direct the Secretary to finance the non-Federal share of the cost of the project, including treatment and distributions components, over a 30-year period in accordance with section 103(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(k)).

**SEC. 3013. RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN LEVEES, ARKANSAS AND LOUISIANA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 173) is amended in the matter under the heading “RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN” by striking “improvements at Calion, Arkansas” and inserting “improvements at Calion, Arkansas (including authorization for the comprehensive flood-control project for Ouachita River and tributaries, incorporating in the project all flood control, drainage, and power improvements in the basin above the lower end of the left bank Ouachita River levee)”.

(b) MODIFICATION.—Section 3 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 642), is amended in the second sentence of subsection (a) in the matter under the heading “LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER” by inserting before the period at the end the following: “; except that the Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana, authorized by the first section of the Mississippi River Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), shall remain as a component of the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project and afforded operation and maintenance responsibilities as provided under section 3 of that Act (45 Stat. 535)”.

**SEC. 3014. CACHE CREEK BASIN, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, Cache Creek Basin, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4112), is modified to direct the Secretary to mitigate the impacts of the new south levee of the Cache Creek settling basin on the storm drainage system of the city of Woodland, including all appurtenant features, erosion control measures, and environmental protection features.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—Mitigation under subsection (a) shall restore the preproject capacity of the city of Woodland to release 1,360 cubic feet per second of water to the Yolo Bypass and shall include—

(1) channel improvements;

(2) an outlet work through the west levee of the Yolo Bypass; and

(3) a new low flow cross channel to handle city and county storm drainage and settling basin flows (1,760 cubic feet per second) when the Yolo Bypass is in a low flow condition.

**SEC. 3015. CALFED STABILITY PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 103(f)(3) of the Water Supply, Reliability, and Environmental Improvement Act (118 Stat. 1695–1696) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “within the Delta (as defined in Cal. Water Code §12220)”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) JUSTIFICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962–2), in carrying out levee stability programs and projects pursuant to this paragraph, the Secretary of the Army may determine that the programs and projects are justified by the benefits of the project purposes described in subparagraph (A), and the programs and projects shall require no additional economic justification if the Secretary of the Army further determines that the programs and projects are cost effective.

“(ii) APPLICABILITY.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any separable element intended to

produce benefits that are predominantly unrelated to the project purposes described in subparagraph (A).”;

(3) in subparagraph (D)(i) by inserting “as described in the Record of Decision” after “Public Law 84–99 standard”.

(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to funds made available pursuant to the Water Supply, Reliability, and Environmental Improvement Act (Public Law 108–361) to carry out section 103(f)(3)(D) of that Act (118 Stat. 1696), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out projects described in that section \$106,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**SEC. 3016. COMPTON CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood control, Los Angeles Drainage Area, California, authorized by section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4611), is modified to add environmental restoration and recreation as project purposes.

**SEC. 3017. GRAYSON CREEK/MURDERER'S CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Grayson Creek/Murderer's Creek, California, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), is modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project; and

(2) to authorize the Secretary to consider national ecosystem restoration benefits in determining the Federal interest in the project.

**SEC. 3018. HAMILTON AIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for environmental restoration, Hamilton Airfield, California, authorized by section 101(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 279), is modified to direct the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 19, 2004, at a total cost of \$228,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$171,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$57,000,000.

**SEC. 3019. JOHN F. BALDWIN SHIP CHANNEL AND STOCKTON SHIP CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for navigation, San Francisco Stockton, California, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1091) is modified—

(1) to provide that the non-Federal share of the cost of the John F. Baldwin Ship Channel and Stockton Ship Channel element of the project may be provided in the form of in-kind services and materials; and

(2) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of such element the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for such element before the date of an agreement for such planning and design.

**SEC. 3020. KAWEAH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood control, Terminus Dam, Kaweah River, California, authorized by section 101(b)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3658), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project, or provide reimbursement not to exceed \$800,000, for the costs of any work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the project partnership agreement.

**SEC. 3021. LARKSPUR FERRY CHANNEL, LARKSPUR, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for navigation, Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California, authorized by



section 601(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148), is modified to direct the Secretary to determine whether maintenance of the project is feasible, and if the Secretary determines that maintenance of the project is feasible, to carry out such maintenance.

**SEC. 3022. LLAGAS CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction, Llagas Creek, California, authorized by section 501(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 333), is modified to direct the Secretary to carry out the project at a total cost of \$105,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$65,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$40,000,000.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In evaluating and implementing the project, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) if the detailed project report evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

**SEC. 3023. MAGPIE CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for Magpie Creek, California, authorized under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), is modified to direct the Secretary to apply the cost-sharing requirements of section 103(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4085) for the portion of the project consisting of land acquisition to preserve and enhance existing floodwater storage.

(b) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(c) COST.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project referred to in subsection (a) shall be \$10,000,000.

**SEC. 3024. PACIFIC FLYWAY CENTER, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Pacific Flyway Center, Sacramento, California, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), is modified to authorize the Secretary to expend \$2,000,000 to enhance public access to the project.

**SEC. 3025. PETALUMA RIVER, PETALUMA, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood damage reduction, Petaluma River, Petaluma, California, authorized by section 112 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2587), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$41,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$26,975,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$14,525,000.

**SEC. 3026. PINOLE CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Pinole Creek Phase I, California, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3027. PRADO DAM, CALIFORNIA.**

Upon completion of the modifications to the Prado Dam element of the project for flood control, Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113), the Memorandum of Agreement for the Operation for Prado Dam for Seasonal Additional Water Conservation between the Department of

the Army and the Orange County Water District (including all the conditions and stipulations in the memorandum) shall remain in effect for volumes of water made available prior to such modifications.

**SEC. 3028. REDWOOD CITY NAVIGATION CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.**

The Secretary may dredge the Redwood City Navigation Channel, California, on an annual basis, to maintain the authorized depth of –30 feet mean lower low water.

**SEC. 3029. SACRAMENTO AND AMERICAN RIVERS FLOOD CONTROL, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) NATOMAS LEVEE FEATURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control and recreation, Sacramento and American Rivers, California (Natomas Levee features), authorized by section 9159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (106 Stat. 1944), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit \$20,503,000 to the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency for the nonreimbursed Federal share of costs incurred by the Agency in connection with the project.

(2) ALLOCATION OF CREDIT.—The Secretary shall allocate the amount to be credited pursuant to paragraph (1) toward the non-Federal share of such projects as are requested by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency.

(b) JOINT FEDERAL PROJECT AT FOLSOM DAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, American and Sacramento Rivers, California, authorized by section 101(a)(6)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 274) and modified by section 128 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2259), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the auxiliary spillway generally in accordance with the Post Authorization Change Report, American River Watershed Project (Folsom Dam Modification and Folsom Dam Raise Projects), dated March 2007, at a total cost of \$683,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$444,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$239,000,000.

(2) DAM SAFETY.—Nothing in this subsection limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to carry out dam safety activities in connection with the auxiliary spillway in accordance with the Bureau of Reclamation safety of dams program.

(3) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior are authorized to transfer between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior appropriated amounts and other available funds (including funds contributed by non-Federal interests) for the purpose of planning, design, and construction of the auxiliary spillway.

(B) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Any transfer made pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be agreed on by the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior.

**SEC. 3030. SACRAMENTO DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for navigation, Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, California, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4092), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3031. SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION, CALIFORNIA.**

Section 202 of the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 49) is amended by striking “and the monetary authorization” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “; except that the lineal feet in the second phase shall be increased from 405,000 lineal feet to 485,000 lineal feet.”.

**SEC. 3032. SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) SALTON SEA AUTHORITY.—The term “Salton Sea Authority” means the joint powers authority established under the laws of the State by a joint power agreement signed on June 2, 1993.

(2) SALTON SEA SCIENCE OFFICE.—The term “Salton Sea Science Office” means the office established by the United States Geological Survey and located on the date of enactment of this Act in La Quinta, California.

(3) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of California.

(b) PILOT PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review the plan approved by the State, entitled the “Salton Sea Ecosystem Restoration Program Preferred Alternative Report and Funding Plan”, and dated May 2007 to determine whether the pilot projects described in the plan are feasible.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), if the Secretary determines that the pilot projects referred to in subparagraph (A) meet the requirements described in that subparagraph, the Secretary may—

(I) enter into an agreement with the State; and

(II) in consultation with the Salton Sea Authority and the Salton Sea Science Office, carry out pilot projects for improvement of the environment in the area of the Salton Sea.

(ii) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall be a party to each contract for construction entered into under this subparagraph.

(2) LOCAL PARTICIPATION.—In prioritizing pilot projects under this section, the Secretary shall—

(A) consult with the State, the Salton Sea Authority, and the Salton Sea Science Office; and

(B) take into consideration the priorities of the State and the Salton Sea Authority.

(3) COST SHARING.—Before carrying out a pilot project under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a written agreement with the State that requires the non-Federal interest for the pilot project to pay 35 percent of the total costs of the pilot project.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (b) \$30,000,000, of which not more than \$5,000,000 shall be used for any one pilot project under this section.

**SEC. 3033. SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood control, Santa Ana River Mainstem (including Santiago Creek, California), authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113) and modified by section 104 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1988 (101 Stat. 1329–111) and section 309 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3713), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project at a total cost of \$1,800,000,000 and to clarify that the Santa Ana River Interceptor Line is an element of the project.

**SEC. 3034. SANTA BARBARA STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood damage reduction, Santa Barbara streams, Lower Mission Creek, California, authorized by section 101(b)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$30,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$15,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$15,000,000.

**SEC. 3035. SANTA CRUZ HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for navigation, Santa Cruz Harbor, California, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 300) and modified by section 809 of the Water Resources

Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4168) and section 526 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 346), is modified to direct the Secretary—

(1) to renegotiate the memorandum of agreement with the non-Federal interest to increase the annual payment to reflect the updated cost of operation and maintenance that is the Federal and non-Federal share as provided by law based on the project purpose; and

(2) to revise the memorandum of agreement to include terms that revise such payments for inflation.

**SEC. 3036. SEVEN OAKS DAM, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood control, Santa Ana Mainstem, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113) and modified by section 104 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1988 (101 Stat. 1329–11), section 102(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4611), and section 311 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3713), is modified to direct the Secretary—

(1) to include ecosystem restoration benefits in the calculation of benefits for the Seven Oaks Dam, California, portion of the project; and

(2) to conduct a study of water conservation and water quality at the Seven Oaks Dam.

**SEC. 3037. UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood damage reduction and recreation, Upper Guadalupe River, California, authorized by section 101(a)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 275), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project generally in accordance with the Upper Guadalupe River Flood Damage Reduction, San Jose, California, Limited Reevaluation Report, dated March 2004, at a total cost of \$256,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$136,700,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$119,300,000.

**SEC. 3038. WALNUT CREEK CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Walnut Creek Channel, California, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), is modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project; and

(2) to authorize the Secretary to consider national ecosystem restoration benefits in determining the Federal interest in the project.

**SEC. 3039. WILDCAT/SAN PABLO CREEK PHASE I, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Wildcat/San Pablo Creek Phase I, California, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3040. WILDCAT/SAN PABLO CREEK PHASE II, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Wildcat/San Pablo Creek Phase II, California, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project and to au-

thorize the Secretary to consider national ecosystem restoration benefits in determining the Federal interest in the project.

**SEC. 3041. YUBA RIVER BASIN PROJECT, CALIFORNIA.**

The project for flood damage reduction, Yuba River Basin, California, authorized by section 101(a)(10) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 275), is modified—

(1) to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$107,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$70,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$37,700,000; and

(2) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3042. SOUTH PLATTE RIVER BASIN, COLORADO.**

Section 808 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4168) is amended by striking “agriculture,” and inserting “agriculture, environmental restoration,”.

**SEC. 3043. INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DELAWARE AND MARYLAND.**

The project for navigation, Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland, authorized by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1030), and section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1249), is modified to add recreation as a project purpose.

**SEC. 3044. ST. GEORGE'S BRIDGE, DELAWARE.**

Section 102(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4612) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary shall assume ownership responsibility for the replacement bridge not later than the date on which the construction of the bridge is completed and the contractors are released of their responsibility by the State. In addition, the Secretary may not carry out any action to close or remove the St. George's Bridge, Delaware, without specific congressional authorization.”.

**SEC. 3045. BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.**

(a) **SHORELINE.**—The project for shoreline protection, Brevard County, Florida, authorized by section 101(b)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3667), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include the mid-reach as an element of the project from the Florida department of environmental protection monuments 75.4 to 118.3, a distance of approximately 7.6 miles. The restoration work shall only be undertaken upon a determination by the Secretary, following completion of the general reevaluation report authorized by section 418 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2637), that the shoreline protection is feasible.

(b) **CREDIT.**—Section 310 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 301) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **CREDIT.**—After completion of the study, the Secretary may credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for shore protection the cost of nourishment and renourishment associated with the project for shore protection incurred by the non-Federal interest to respond to damages to Brevard County beaches that are the result of a Federal navigation project, as determined in the final report for the study.”.

**SEC. 3046. BROWARD COUNTY AND HILLSBORO INLET, FLORIDA.**

The project for shore protection, Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1090), and modified by section 311 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 301), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221

of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of mitigation construction and derelict erosion control structure removal carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3047. CANAVERAL HARBOR, FLORIDA.**

In carrying out the project for navigation, Canaveral Harbor, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1174), the Secretary shall construct a sediment trap if the Secretary determines construction of the sediment trap is feasible.

**SEC. 3048. GASPARILLA AND ESTERO ISLANDS, FLORIDA.**

The project for shore protection, Gasparilla and Estero Island segments, Lee County, Florida, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1073), by Senate Resolution dated December 17, 1970, and by House Resolution dated December 15, 1970, and modified by section 309 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2602), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3049. LIDO KEY BEACH, SARASOTA, FLORIDA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for shore protection, Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1819), deauthorized under section 1001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), and reauthorized by section 364(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 313), is modified to direct the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 22, 2004, at a total cost of \$15,190,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$9,320,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,870,000, and at an estimated total cost of \$65,000,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated Federal cost of \$30,550,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$34,450,000.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION OF SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.**—The Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with the non-Federal interest in accordance with section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 426i–1) for the modified project.

**SEC. 3050. PEANUT ISLAND, FLORIDA.**

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Peanut Island, Palm Beach County, Florida, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) shall be \$9,750,000.

**SEC. 3051. PORT SUTTON, FLORIDA.**

The project for navigation, Port Sutton, Florida, authorized by section 101(b)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project at a total cost of \$12,900,000.

**SEC. 3052. TAMPA HARBOR-BIG BEND CHANNEL, FLORIDA.**

The project for navigation, Tampa Harbor-Big Bend Channel, Florida, authorized by section 101(a)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 276) is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.



**SEC. 3053. TAMPA HARBOR CUT B, FLORIDA.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for navigation, Tampa Harbor, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1818), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct passing lanes in an area approximately 3.5 miles long and centered on Tampa Harbor Cut B if the Secretary determines that such improvements are necessary for navigation safety.

(b) *GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT.*—The non-Federal share of the cost of the general reevaluation report for Tampa Harbor, Florida, being conducted on June 1, 2005, shall be the same percentage as the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of the project.

(c) *AGREEMENT.*—The Secretary shall enter into a new partnership agreement with the non-Federal interest to reflect the cost sharing required by subsection (b).

**SEC. 3054. ALLATOONA LAKE, GEORGIA.**

(a) *LAND EXCHANGE.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary may exchange land above 863 feet in elevation at Allatoona Lake, Georgia, identified in the Real Estate Design Memorandum prepared by the Mobile district engineer, April 5, 1996, and approved October 8, 1996, for land on the north side of Allatoona Lake that is required for wildlife management and protection of the water quality and overall environment of Allatoona Lake.

(2) *TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—The basis for all land exchanges under this subsection shall be a fair market appraisal to ensure that land exchanged is of equal value.

(b) *DISPOSAL AND ACQUISITION OF LAND, ALLATOONA LAKE, GEORGIA.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary may—

(A) sell land above 863 feet in elevation at Allatoona Lake, Georgia, identified in the memorandum referred to in subsection (a)(1); and

(B) use the proceeds of the sale, without further appropriation, to pay costs associated with the purchase of land required for wildlife management and protection of the water quality and overall environment of Allatoona Lake.

(2) *TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—

(A) *WILLING SELLERS.*—Land acquired under this subsection shall be by negotiated purchase from willing sellers only.

(B) *BASIS.*—The basis for all transactions under this subsection shall be a fair market value appraisal acceptable to the Secretary.

(C) *SHARING OF COSTS.*—Each purchaser of land under this subsection shall share in the associated costs of the purchase, including surveys and associated fees in accordance with the memorandum referred to in subsection (a)(1).

(D) *OTHER CONDITIONS.*—The Secretary may impose on the sale and purchase of land under this subsection such other conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) *REPEAL.*—Section 325 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4849) is repealed.

**SEC. 3055. LATHAM RIVER, GLYNN COUNTY, GEORGIA.**

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Latham River, Glynn County, Georgia, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) shall be \$6,175,000.

**SEC. 3056. DWORSHAK RESERVOIR IMPROVEMENTS, IDAHO.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall carry out additional general construction measures to allow for operation at lower pool levels to satisfy the recreation mission at Dworshak Dam, Idaho.

(b) *IMPROVEMENTS.*—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide for appropriate improvements to—

(1) facilities that are operated by the Corps of Engineers; and

(2) facilities that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are leased, permitted, or licensed for use by others.

(c) *COST SHARING.*—The Secretary shall carry out this section through a cost-sharing program with Idaho State parks and recreation department at a total estimated project cost of \$5,300,000. Notwithstanding section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2313), the Federal share of such cost shall be 75 percent.

**SEC. 3057. LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, IDAHO.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for flood control, Gooding, Idaho, constructed under the emergency conservation work program established under the Act of March 31, 1933 (16 U.S.C. 585 et seq.), is modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to rehabilitate the Gooding Channel project for the purposes of flood control and ecosystem restoration if the Secretary determines that such rehabilitation is not required as a result of improper operation and maintenance of the project by the non-Federal interest and that the rehabilitation and ecosystem restoration is feasible; and

(2) to direct the Secretary to plan, design, and construct the project at a total cost of \$9,000,000.

(b) *COST SHARING.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Costs for reconstruction of a project under this section shall be shared by the Secretary and the non-Federal interest in the same percentages as the costs of construction of the original project were shared.

(2) *OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR COSTS.*—The costs of operation, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of a project carried out under this section shall be a non-Federal responsibility.

(c) *ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION.*—Reconstruction efforts and activities carried out under this section shall not require economic justification.

**SEC. 3058. BEARDSTOWN COMMUNITY BOAT HARBOR, BEARDSTOWN, ILLINOIS.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The project for navigation, Muscooten Bay, Illinois River, Beardstown Community Boat Harbor, Beardstown, Illinois, constructed under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), is modified—

(1) to include the channel between the harbor and the Illinois River; and

(2) to direct the Secretary to enter into a partnership agreement with the city of Beardstown to replace the local cooperation agreement dated August 18, 1983, with the Beardstown Community Park District.

(b) *TERMS OF PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.*—The partnership agreement referred to in subsection (a) shall include the same rights and responsibilities as the local cooperation agreement dated August 18, 1983, changing only the identity of the non-Federal sponsor.

(c) *MAINTENANCE.*—Following execution of the partnership agreement referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary may carry out maintenance of the project referred to in subsection (a) on an annual basis.

**SEC. 3059. CACHE RIVER LEVEE, ILLINOIS.**

The Cache River Levee constructed for flood control at the Cache River, Illinois, and authorized by the Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1217), is modified to add environmental restoration as a project purpose.

**SEC. 3060. CHICAGO RIVER, ILLINOIS.**

The Federal navigation channel for the North Branch Channel portion of the Chicago River authorized by section 22 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1156), extending from 100 feet downstream of the Halsted Street Bridge to 100 feet upstream of the Division Street Bridge, Chicago, Illinois, shall be no wider than 66 feet.

**SEC. 3061. CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIERS PROJECT, ILLINOIS.**

(a) *TREATMENT AS SINGLE PROJECT.*—The Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier Project (in this section referred to as “Barrier

I”), as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act and constructed as a demonstration project under section 1202(i)(3) of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4722(i)(3)), and the project relating to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, authorized by section 345 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–335; 118 Stat. 1352) (in this section referred to as “Barrier II”) shall be considered to constitute a single project.

(b) *AUTHORIZATION.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary, at Federal expense, shall—

(A) upgrade and make permanent Barrier I;

(B) construct Barrier II, notwithstanding the project cooperation agreement with the State of Illinois dated June 14, 2005;

(C) operate and maintain Barrier I and Barrier II as a system to optimize effectiveness;

(D) conduct, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental entities, a study of a range of options and technologies for reducing impacts of hazards that may reduce the efficacy of the Barriers; and

(E) provide to each State a credit in an amount equal to the amount of funds contributed by the State toward Barrier II.

(2) *USE OF CREDIT.*—A State may apply a credit provided to the State under paragraph (1)(E) to any cost sharing responsibility for an existing or future Federal project carried out by the Secretary in the State.

(c) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Section 345 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–335; 118 Stat. 1352) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 345. CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, ILLINOIS.**

“There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the Barrier II element of the project for the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois, initiated pursuant to section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2294 note; 100 Stat. 4251).”

(d) *FEASIBILITY STUDY.*—The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental entities, shall conduct, at Federal expense, a feasibility study of the range of options and technologies available to prevent the spread of aquatic nuisance species between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basins through the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal and other aquatic pathways.

**SEC. 3062. EMIQUON, ILLINOIS.**

(a) *MAXIMUM AMOUNT.*—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Emiquon, Illinois, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), shall be \$7,500,000.

(b) *LIMITATION.*—Nothing in this section shall affect the eligibility of the project for emergency repair assistance under section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n).

**SEC. 3063. LASALLE, ILLINOIS.**

In carrying out section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4639–4640), the Secretary shall give priority to work in the vicinity of LaSalle, Illinois, on the Illinois and Michigan Canal.

**SEC. 3064. SPUNKY BOTTOMS, ILLINOIS.**

(a) *PROJECT PURPOSE.*—The project for flood control, Spunky Bottoms, Illinois, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1583), is modified to add environmental restoration as a project purpose.

(b) *MAXIMUM AMOUNT.*—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Spunky Bottoms, Illinois, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), shall be \$7,500,000.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in this section shall affect the eligibility of the project for emergency repair assistance under section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n).

(d) **POST CONSTRUCTION MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT.**—Of the Federal funds expended under subsection (b), not less than \$500,000 shall remain available for a period of 5 years after the date of completion of construction of the modifications for use in carrying out post construction monitoring and adaptive management.

#### **SEC. 3065. CEDAR LAKE, INDIANA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to plan, design, and construct an aquatic ecosystem restoration project at Cedar Lake, Indiana.

(b) **COMPLETE FEASIBILITY REPORT.**—In planning the project authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary shall expedite completion of the feasibility report for the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection, Cedar Lake, Indiana, initiated pursuant to section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

#### **(c) AUTHORIZATION.**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$11,050,000 to carry out the activities authorized by this section.

(2) **OTHER.**—The Secretary is authorized to use funds previously appropriated for the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection, Cedar Lake, Indiana, under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) to carry out the activities authorized by this section.

#### **SEC. 3066. KOONTZ LAKE, INDIANA.**

The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Koontz Lake, Indiana, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) and modified by section 520 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2655), is modified to direct the Secretary to seek to reduce the cost of the project by using innovative technologies and cost reduction measures determined from a review of non-Federal lake dredging projects in the vicinity of Koontz Lake.

#### **SEC. 3067. WHITE RIVER, INDIANA.**

The project for flood control, Indianapolis on West Fork of White River, Indiana, authorized by section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1586), and modified by section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716) and section 322 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 303), is modified—

(1) to authorize the Secretary to carry out the ecosystem restoration, recreation, and flood damage reduction components described in the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Plan, dated February 1994, and revised by the Master Plan Revision Central Indianapolis Waterfront, dated April 2004, at a total cost of \$28,545,000; and

(2) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

#### **SEC. 3068. DES MOINES RIVER AND GREENBELT, IOWA.**

The project for the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa, authorized by Public Law 99–88 and modified by section 604 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4153), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out ecosystem restoration, recreation, and flood damage reduction components of the project, at a Federal cost of \$10,000,000.

#### **SEC. 3069. PERRY CREEK, IOWA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On making a determination described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall increase the Federal contribution by up to \$4,000,000 for the project for flood control, Perry Creek, Iowa, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4116) and modified by section 151 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (117 Stat. 1844).

(b) **DETERMINATION.**—A determination referred to in subsection (a) is a determination that a modification to the project described in subsection (a) is necessary for the Federal Emergency Management Agency to certify that the project provides flood damage reduction benefits to at least a 100-year level of flood protection.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$4,000,000.

#### **SEC. 3070. RATHBUN LAKE, IOWA.**

(a) **RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.**—The Secretary shall provide, in accordance with the recommendations in the Rathbun Lake Reallocation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on July 22, 1985, the Rathbun Regional Water Association with the right of first refusal to contract for or purchase any increment of the remaining allocation of 8,320 acre-feet of water supply storage in Rathbun Lake, Iowa.

(b) **PAYMENT OF COST.**—The Rathbun Regional Water Association shall pay the cost of any water supply storage allocation provided under subsection (a).

#### **SEC. 3071. HICKMAN BLUFF STABILIZATION, KENTUCKY.**

The project for Hickman Bluff, Kentucky, authorized by chapter II of title II of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for the Department of Defense to Preserve and Enhance Military Readiness Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 85), is modified to authorize the Secretary to repair and restore the project, at Federal expense, with no further economic studies or analyses, at a total cost of not more than \$250,000.

#### **SEC. 3072. MCALPINE LOCK AND DAM, KENTUCKY AND INDIANA.**

Section 101(a)(10) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606) is amended by striking “\$219,600,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$430,000,000”.

#### **SEC. 3073. PRESTONSBURG, KENTUCKY.**

The Prestonsburg, Kentucky, element of the project for flood control, Levisa and Tug Fork of the Big Sandy and Cumberland Rivers, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky, authorized by section 202(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1339), is modified to direct the Secretary to take measures to provide a 100-year level of flood protection for the city of Prestonsburg.

#### **SEC. 3074. AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH WATERSHED.**

The project for flood damage reduction and recreation, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed, authorized by section 101(a)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 277) and modified by section 116 of division D of Public Law 108–7 (117 Stat. 140), is further modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to carry out the project with the cost sharing for the project determined in accordance with section 103(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(a)), as in effect on October 11, 1996;

(2) to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$187,000,000; and

(3) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

#### **SEC. 3075. ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LOUISIANA.**

(a) **ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND.**—The public access feature of the project for flood control, Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4142), is modified to authorize the Secretary to acquire from willing sellers the fee interest (exclusive of oil, gas, and minerals) of an additional 20,000 acres of land in the Lower Atchafalaya Basin Floodway for such feature.

#### **(b) MODIFICATION.**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), effective November 17, 1986, the \$32,000,000 limitation on the maximum Federal expenditure for the first costs of the public access feature referred to in subsection (a) shall not apply.

(2) **COST.**—The modification under paragraph (1) shall not increase the total authorized cost of the project referred to in subsection (a).

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Section 315(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2603) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and shall consider Eagle Point Park, Jeanerette, Louisiana, and the town of Melville, Louisiana, as site alternatives for such recreation features”.

#### **SEC. 3076. ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, REGIONAL VISITOR CENTER, LOUISIANA.**

(a) **PROJECT FOR FLOOD CONTROL.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 28, 1983 (relating to recreational development in the Lower Atchafalaya Basin Floodway), the Secretary shall carry out the project for flood control, Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana, authorized by chapter IV of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (99 Stat. 313) and section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4142).

#### **(b) VISITORS CENTER.**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the State of Louisiana, shall study, design, and construct a type A regional visitors center in the vicinity of Morgan City, Louisiana.

#### **(2) COST SHARING.**

(A) **COST OF TYPE B VISITORS CENTER.**—The cost of construction of the visitors center up to the cost of construction of a type B visitors center shall be shared in accordance with the recreation cost-sharing requirement of section 103(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(c)).

(B) **COST OF UPGRADING.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of upgrading the visitors center from a type B to type A regional visitors center shall be 100 percent.

(C) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The cost of operation and maintenance of the visitors center shall be a Federal responsibility.

(3) **DONATIONS.**—In carrying out the project under this subsection, the Mississippi River Commission may accept the donation of cash or other funds, land, materials, and services from any non-Federal government entity or nonprofit corporation, as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

#### **SEC. 3077. ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF, AND BLACK, LOUISIANA.**

The project for navigation, Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, Louisiana, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731), is modified to authorize the Secretary to deepen up to a 1000-foot section of the area on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway west of the Bayou Boeuf Lock and east of the intersection of the Atchafalaya River, at a cost not to exceed \$200,000, to provide for ingress and egress to the port of Morgan City at a depth not to exceed 20 feet.

#### **SEC. 3078. BAYOU PLAQUEMINE, LOUISIANA.**

The project for the improvement of the quality of the environment, Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana, being carried out under section 1135 of

the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3079. CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LOUISIANA.**

The project for the Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 481), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide \$3,000,000 for each fiscal year, in a total amount of \$15,000,000, for such rock bank protection of the Calcasieu River from mile 5 to mile 16 as the Secretary determines to be advisable to reduce maintenance dredging needs and facilitate protection of disposal areas for the Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana, if the Secretary determines that the rock bank protection is feasible.

**SEC. 3080. RED RIVER (J. BENNETT JOHNSTON) WATERWAY, LOUISIANA.**

The project for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses, Red River Waterway, Louisiana, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4142) and modified by section 4(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4016), section 102(p) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4613), section 301(b)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3710), and section 316 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2604), is modified—

(1) to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project at a total cost of \$33,912,000;

(2) to authorize the purchase and reforestation of lands that have been cleared or converted to agricultural uses (in addition to the purchase of bottomland hardwood); and

(3) to incorporate wildlife and forestry management practices to improve species diversity on mitigation land that meets habitat goals and objectives of the United States and the State of Louisiana.

**SEC. 3081. MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LOUISIANA.**

The Mississippi Delta Region project, Louisiana, authorized as part of the project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077) and modified by section 365 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3739), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the costs of relocating oyster beds in the Davis Pond project area.

**SEC. 3082. MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET RELOCATION ASSISTANCE, LOUISIANA.**

(a) PORT FACILITIES RELOCATION.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development (referred to in this section as the “Assistant Secretary”) \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended, to support the relocation of Port of New Orleans deep draft facilities from the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet (referred to in this section as the “Outlet”), the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, and the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal to the Mississippi River.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Assistant Secretary pursuant to sections 209(c)(2) and 703 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3149(c)(2), 3233).

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The Assistant Secretary shall make amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) available to the Port of New Orleans to relocate to the Mississippi River within

the State of Louisiana the port-owned facilities that are occupied by businesses in the vicinity that may be impacted due to the treatment of the Outlet under title VII of this Act.

(b) REVOLVING LOAN FUND GRANTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Assistant Secretary \$85,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide assistance pursuant to sections 209(c)(2) and 703 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3149(c)(2), 3233) to one or more eligible recipients under such Act to establish revolving loan funds to make loans for terms up to 20 years at or below market interest rates (including interest-free loans) to private businesses within the Port of New Orleans that may need to relocate to the Mississippi River within the State of Louisiana due to the treatment of the Outlet under title VII of this Act.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In selecting one or more recipients under subsection (b), the Assistant Secretary shall ensure that each recipient has established procedures to target lending to businesses that will be directly and substantially impacted by the treatment of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet under title VII of this Act.

(d) COORDINATION WITH SECRETARY.—The Assistant Secretary shall ensure that the programs described in subsections (a) and (b) are coordinated with the Secretary to ensure that facilities are relocated in a manner that is consistent with the analysis and design of comprehensive hurricane protection authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2247).

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Assistant Secretary may use up to 2 percent of the amounts made available under subsections (a) and (b) for administrative expenses.

**SEC. 3083. VIOLET, LOUISIANA.**

(a) VIOLET DIVERSION PROJECT.—The Secretary shall design and implement a project for a diversion of freshwater at or near Violet, Louisiana, for the purposes of reducing salinity in the western Mississippi Sound, enhancing oyster production, and promoting the sustainability of coastal wetlands.

(b) SALINITY LEVELS.—The project shall be designed to meet, or maximize the ability to meet, the salinity levels identified in the feasibility study of the Corps of Engineers entitled “Mississippi and Louisiana Estuarine Areas: Freshwater Diversion to Lake Pontchartrain Basin and Mississippi Sound” and dated 1984.

(c) ADDITIONAL MEASURES.—

(1) RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Secretary determines that the diversion of freshwater at or near Violet, Louisiana, will not restore salinity levels to meet the requirements of subsection (b), the Secretary shall recommend additional measures for freshwater diversions sufficient to meet those levels.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall implement measures included in the recommendations developed under paragraph (1) beginning 60 days after the date on which a report containing the recommendations is provided to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(d) NON-FEDERAL FINANCING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ESTIMATES.—Before October 1 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall notify the States of Louisiana and Mississippi of each State’s respective estimated costs for that fiscal year for the activities authorized under this section.

(2) ESCROW.—The States of Louisiana and Mississippi shall provide the funds described in paragraph (1) by making a deposit into an escrow account, or such other account, of the Treasury as the Secretary determines to be acceptable within 30 days after the date of receipt of the notification from the Secretary under paragraph (1).

(3) DEPOSITS BY LOUISIANA.—

(A) USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—The State of Louisiana may use funds available to the State under the coastal impact assistance program authorized under section 31 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356a) in meeting its cost-sharing responsibilities under this section.

(B) FAILURE TO PROVIDE FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the State of Louisiana does not provide the funds under paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Interior, using funds to be disbursed to the State under the program referred to in subparagraph (A) or under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (title I of Division C of Public Law 109-432; (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; 120 Stat. 3000)), shall deposit such funds as are necessary to meet the requirements for the State under paragraph (2).

(ii) DEADLINE FOR DEPOSIT.—Any deposit required under clause (i) shall be made prior to any other disbursements made to the State of Louisiana under the programs referred to in clause (i).

(C) EXCEPTION.—The State of Louisiana shall not be required to make a deposit of its share in any fiscal year in which the State of Mississippi does not make its deposit following a notification under paragraph (1) or the State of Mississippi notifies the Secretary that it does not intend to make a deposit in that fiscal year.

(4) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the costs of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(5) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project authorized by subsection (a) shall be 75 percent.

(e) SCHEDULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall complete the design of the project not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and shall complete the construction of the project by not later than September 30, 2012.

(2) MISSED DEADLINE.—If the Secretary does not complete the design or construction of the project in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall complete the design or construction as expeditiously as possible.

**SEC. 3084. WEST BANK OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER (EAST OF HARVEY CANAL), LOUISIANA.**

Section 328 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 304-305) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “operation and maintenance” and inserting “operation, maintenance, rehabilitation, repair, and replacement”; and

(B) by striking “Algiers Channel” and inserting “Algiers Canal Levees”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent.”.

**SEC. 3085. CAMP ELLIS, SACO, MAINE.**

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project being carried out under section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i) for the mitigation of shore damages attributable to the project for navigation, Camp Ellis, Saco, Maine, shall be \$26,900,000.

**SEC. 3086. CUMBERLAND, MARYLAND.**

Section 580(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 375) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$15,000,000” and inserting “\$25,750,000”;

(2) by striking “\$9,750,000” and inserting “\$16,738,000”; and

(3) by striking “\$5,250,000” and inserting “\$9,012,000”.

**SEC. 3087. POPLAR ISLAND, MARYLAND.**

The project for navigation and environmental restoration through the beneficial use of dredged material, Poplar Island, Maryland, authorized by section 537 of the Water Resources

Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3776) and modified by section 318 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2604), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the expansion of the project in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 31, 2006, at an additional total cost of \$260,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$195,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$65,000,000.

**SEC. 3088. DETROIT RIVER SHORELINE, DETROIT, MICHIGAN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for emergency streambank and shoreline protection, Detroit River Shoreline, Detroit, Michigan, being carried out under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), is modified to include measures to enhance public access.

(b) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project shall be \$3,000,000.

**SEC. 3089. ST. CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST. CLAIR, MICHIGAN.**

Section 426 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 326) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 426. ST. CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST. CLAIR, MICHIGAN.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ‘management plan’ means the management plan for the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, Michigan, that is in effect as of the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

“(2) PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘Partnership’ means the partnership established by the Secretary under subsection (b)(1).

“(b) PARTNERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and lead a partnership of appropriate Federal agencies (including the Environmental Protection Agency) and the State of Michigan (including political subdivisions of the State)—

“(A) to promote cooperation among the Federal Government, State and local governments, and other involved parties in the management of the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair watersheds; and

“(B) to develop and implement projects consistent with the management plan.

“(2) COORDINATION WITH ACTIONS UNDER OTHER LAW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Actions taken under this section by the Partnership shall be coordinated with actions to restore and conserve the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair and watersheds taken under other provisions of Federal and State law.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this section alters, modifies, or affects any other provision of Federal or State law.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF ST. CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST. CLAIR MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) develop a St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair strategic implementation plan in accordance with the management plan;

“(B) provide technical, planning, and engineering assistance to non-Federal interests for developing and implementing activities consistent with the management plan;

“(C) plan, design, and implement projects consistent with the management plan; and

“(D) provide, in coordination with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, financial and technical assistance, including grants, to the State of Michigan (including political subdivisions of the State) and interested nonprofit entities for the Federal share of the cost of planning, design, and implementation of projects to restore, conserve, manage, and sustain the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and associated watersheds.

“(2) SPECIFIC MEASURES.—Financial and technical assistance provided under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) may be used in

support of non-Federal activities consistent with the management plan.

“(d) SUPPLEMENTS TO MANAGEMENT PLAN AND STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—In consultation with the Partnership and after providing an opportunity for public review and comment, the Secretary shall develop information to supplement—

“(1) the management plan; and

“(2) the strategic implementation plan developed under subsection (c)(1)(A).

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000.”

**SEC. 3090. ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MICHIGAN.**

The Secretary shall expedite development of the dredged material management plan for the project for navigation, St. Joseph Harbor, Michigan, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 299).

**SEC. 3091. SAULT SAINTE MARIE, MICHIGAN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The text of section 1149 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4254) is amended to read as follows:

“The Secretary shall construct, at Federal expense, a second lock, of a width not less than 110 feet and a length not less than 1,200 feet, adjacent to the existing lock at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, generally in accordance with the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated May 19, 1986, and the limited re-evaluation report dated February 2004 at a total cost of \$341,714,000.”

(b) CONFORMING REPEALS.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Section 107(a)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4620).

(2) Section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3717).

(3) Section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 305).

**SEC. 3092. ADA, MINNESOTA.**

In carrying out the project for flood damage reduction, Wild Rice River, Ada, Minnesota, under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) if the detailed project report evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

**SEC. 3093. DULUTH HARBOR, MCQUADE ROAD, MINNESOTA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Duluth Harbor, McQuade Road, Minnesota, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) and modified by section 321 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2605), is modified to direct the Secretary to provide public access and recreational facilities as generally described in the Detailed Project Report and Environmental Assessment, McQuade Road Harbor of Refuge, Duluth, Minnesota, dated August 1999.

(b) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the costs of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(c) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project shall be \$9,000,000.

**SEC. 3094. GRAND MARAIS, MINNESOTA.**

The project for navigation, Grand Marais, Minnesota, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3095. GRAND PORTAGE HARBOR, MINNESOTA.**

The Secretary shall provide credit in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b) toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the navigation project for Grand Portage Harbor, Minnesota, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), for the costs of design work carried out for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3096. GRANITE FALLS, MINNESOTA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is directed to implement the locally preferred plan for flood damage reduction, Granite Falls, Minnesota, at a total cost of \$12,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,000,000. In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, the existing detailed project report dated 2002 for the project prepared under the authority of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(b) PROJECT FINANCING.—In evaluating and implementing the project under this section, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interests to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) if the detailed project report evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

(c) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the project the cost of design and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of execution of a partnership agreement for the project.

(d) MAXIMUM FUNDING.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the flood damage reduction shall be \$8,000,000.

**SEC. 3097. KNIFE RIVER HARBOR, MINNESOTA.**

The project for navigation, Harbor at Knife River, Minnesota, authorized by section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 19), is modified to direct the Secretary to develop a final design and prepare plans and specifications to correct the harbor entrance and mooring conditions at the project.

**SEC. 3098. RED LAKE RIVER, MINNESOTA.**

The project for flood control, Red Lake River, Crookston, Minnesota, authorized by section 101(a)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 278), is modified to include flood protection for the adjacent and interconnected areas generally known as the Sampson and Chase/Loring neighborhoods, in accordance with the feasibility report supplement for local flood protection, Crookston, Minnesota, at a total cost of \$25,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$16,250,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$8,750,000.

**SEC. 3099. SILVER BAY, MINNESOTA.**

The project for navigation, Silver Bay, Minnesota, authorized by section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 19), is modified to include operation and maintenance of the general navigation facilities as a Federal responsibility.

**SEC. 3100. TACONITE HARBOR, MINNESOTA.**

The project for navigation, Taconite Harbor, Minnesota, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), is modified to include operation and maintenance of the general navigation facilities as a Federal responsibility.

**SEC. 3101. TWO HARBORS, MINNESOTA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 107(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577(a)), the project for navigation, Two Harbors, Minnesota, being carried out under such authority, is justified on the basis of navigation safety.

(b) **MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURES.**—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project shall be \$7,000,000.

**SEC. 3102. DEER ISLAND, HARRISON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.**

The project for ecosystem restoration, Deer Island, Harrison County, Mississippi, being carried out under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326), is modified to authorize the non-Federal interest to provide, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), any portion of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project in the form of in-kind services and materials.

**SEC. 3103. JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.**

(a) **MODIFICATION.**—Section 331 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 305) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$9,000,000”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT.**—The credit provided by section 331 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 305) (as amended by subsection (a) of this section) shall apply to costs incurred by the Jackson County Board of Supervisors during the period beginning on February 8, 1994, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for projects authorized by section 219(c)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 1494).

**SEC. 3104. PEARL RIVER BASIN, MISSISSIPPI.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for flood damage reduction, Pearl River Basin, including Shoccoe, Mississippi, authorized by section 401(e)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4132), is modified to authorize the Secretary, subject to subsection (c), to construct the project generally in accordance with the plan described in the “Pearl River Watershed, Mississippi, Feasibility Study Main Report, Preliminary Draft”, dated February 2007, at a total cost of \$205,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$133,770,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$72,030,000.

(b) **COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES.**—Before initiating construction of the project, the Secretary shall compare the level of flood damage reduction provided by the plan that maximizes national economic development benefits of the project and the locally preferred plan, referred to as the LeFleur Lakes plan, to that portion of Jackson, Mississippi and vicinity, located below the Ross Barnett Reservoir Dam.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary determines under subsection (b) that the locally preferred plan provides a level of flood damage reduction that is equal to or greater than the level of flood damage reduction provided by the national economic development plan and that the locally preferred plan is environmentally acceptable and technically feasible, the Secretary may construct the project identified as the national economic development plan, or the locally preferred plan, or some combination thereof.

(2) **CONSTRUCTION BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.**—The non-Federal interest may carry out the project under section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b–13).

(d) **PROJECT FINANCING.**—In evaluating and implementing the project under this section, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interests to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) if the detailed project report evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

(e) **NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.**—If the locally preferred plan is selected for construction of the project, the Federal share of the cost of the project shall be limited to the share as provided by law for the elements of the national economic development plan.

**SEC. 3105. FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MISSOURI.**

Section 102(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 282) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$13,000,000”.

**SEC. 3106. L–15 LEVEE, MISSOURI.**

The portion of the L–15 levee system that is under the jurisdiction of the Consolidated North County Levee District and situated along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River from the confluence of that river with the Missouri River and running upstream approximately 14 miles shall be considered to be a Federal levee for purposes of cost sharing under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n).

**SEC. 3107. MONARCH-CHESTERFIELD, MISSOURI.**

The project for flood damage reduction, Monarch-Chesterfield, Missouri, authorized by section 101(b)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2578), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of the planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3108. RIVER DES PERES, MISSOURI.**

The projects for flood control, River Des Peres, Missouri, authorized by section 101(a)(17) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4607) and section 102(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3668), are each modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3109. LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT, MONTANA.**

The Secretary may use funds appropriated to carry out the Missouri River recovery and mitigation program to assist the Bureau of Reclamation in the design and construction of the Lower Yellowstone project of the Bureau, Intake, Montana, for the purpose of ecosystem restoration.

**SEC. 3110. YELLOWSTONE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MONTANA AND NORTH DAKOTA.**

(a) **DEFINITION OF RESTORATION PROJECT.**—In this section, the term “restoration project” means a project that will produce, in accordance with other Federal programs, projects, and activities, substantial ecosystem restoration and related benefits, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) **PROJECTS.**—The Secretary shall carry out, in accordance with other Federal programs, projects, and activities, restoration projects in the watershed of the Yellowstone River and tributaries in Montana, and in North Dakota, to produce immediate and substantial ecosystem restoration and recreation benefits.

(c) **LOCAL PARTICIPATION.**—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with, and consider the activities being carried out by—

- (A) other Federal agencies;
- (B) Indian tribes;
- (C) conservation districts; and
- (D) the Yellowstone River Conservation District Council; and

(2) seek the participation of the State of Montana.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000.

**SEC. 3111. ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.**

The project for flood damage reduction, Antelope Creek, Lincoln, Nebraska, authorized by section 101(b)(19) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2578), is modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act

of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project; and

(2) to allow the non-Federal interest for the project to use, and to direct the Secretary to accept, funds provided under any other Federal program to satisfy, in whole or in part, the non-Federal share of the project if the Federal agency that provides such funds determines that the funds are authorized to be used to carry out the project.

**SEC. 3112. SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NEBRASKA.**

The project for ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction, Sand Creek watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska, authorized by section 101(b)(20) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2578), is modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project or reimbursement for the costs of any work performed by the non-Federal interest for the project before the approval of the project partnership agreement, including work performed by the non-Federal interest in connection with the design and construction of 7 upstream detention storage structures;

(2) to require that in-kind work to be credited under paragraph (1) be subject to audit; and

(3) to direct the Secretary to accept advance funds from the non-Federal interest as needed to maintain the project schedule.

**SEC. 3113. WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NEBRASKA.**

The project for ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction, Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska, authorized by section 101(b)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2578), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$21,664,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$14,082,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,582,000.

**SEC. 3114. LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, MCCARRAN RANCH, NEVADA.**

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project being carried out, as of the date of enactment of this Act, under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) for environmental restoration of McCarran Ranch, Nevada, shall be \$5,775,000.

**SEC. 3115. LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NEW JERSEY.**

The project for navigation mitigation, ecosystem restoration, shore protection, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey, authorized by section 101(a)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 278), is modified to incorporate the project for shoreline erosion control, Cape May Point, New Jersey, carried out under section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426h), if the Secretary determines that such incorporation is feasible.

**SEC. 3116. PASSAIC RIVER BASIN FLOOD MANAGEMENT, NEW JERSEY.**

The project for flood control, Passaic River, New Jersey and New York, authorized by section 101(a)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4607) and modified by section 327 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2607), is modified to direct the Secretary to include the benefits and costs of preserving natural flood storage in any future economic analysis of the project.

**SEC. 3117. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, NEW MEXICO.**

The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with any Indian tribe any land of



which is located in the State of New Mexico and occupied by a flood control project that is owned and operated by the Corps of Engineers to assist in carrying out any operation or maintenance activity associated with the flood control project.

**SEC. 3118. MIDDLE RIO GRANDE RESTORATION, NEW MEXICO.**

(a) **RESTORATION PROJECTS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “restoration project” means a project that will produce, consistent with other Federal programs, projects, and activities, immediate and substantial ecosystem restoration and recreation benefits.

(b) **PROJECT SELECTION.**—The Secretary shall select and shall carry out restoration projects in the Middle Rio Grande from Cochiti Dam to the headwaters of Elephant Butte Reservoir in the State of New Mexico.

(c) **LOCAL PARTICIPATION.**—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary shall consult with, and consider the activities being carried out by—

(1) the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program; and

(2) the Bosque Improvement Group of the Middle Rio Grande Bosque Initiative.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 3119. BUFFALO HARBOR, NEW YORK.**

The project for navigation, Buffalo Harbor, New York, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1176), is modified to include measures to enhance public access, at Federal cost of \$500,000.

**SEC. 3120. LONG ISLAND SOUND OYSTER RESTORATION, NEW YORK AND CONNECTICUT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall plan, design, and construct projects to increase aquatic habitats within Long Island Sound and adjacent waters, including the construction and restoration of oyster beds and related shellfish habitat.

(b) **COST SHARING.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of activities carried out under this section shall be 25 percent and may be provided through in-kind services and materials.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 3121. MAMARONECK AND SHELDRAKE RIVERS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, NEW YORK.**

(a) **WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the State of New York and local entities, shall develop watershed management plans for the Mamaroneck and Sheldrake River watershed for the purposes of evaluating existing and new flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration.

(2) **EXISTING PLANS.**—In developing the watershed management plans, the Secretary shall use existing studies and plans, as appropriate.

(b) **CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may participate in any eligible critical restoration project in the Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers watershed in accordance with the watershed management plans developed under subsection (a).

(2) **ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.**—A critical restoration project shall be eligible for assistance under this section if the project—

(A) meets the purposes described in the watershed management plans developed under subsection (a); and

(B) with respect to the Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers watershed in New York, consists of flood damage reduction or ecosystem restoration through—

(i) bank stabilization of the mainstem, tributaries, and streams;

(ii) wetland restoration;

(iii) soil and water conservation;

(iv) restoration of natural flows;

(v) restoration of stream stability;

(vi) structural and nonstructural flood damage reduction measures; or

(vii) any other project or activity the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into one or more cooperative agreements to provide financial assistance to appropriate Federal, State, or local governments or nonprofit agencies, including assistance for the implementation of projects to be carried out under subsection (b).

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**SEC. 3122. ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NEW YORK.**

Section 554 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3781) is amended by striking “maximum Federal cost of \$5,200,000” and inserting “total cost of \$20,000,000”.

**SEC. 3123. PORT OF NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.**

The navigation project, Port of New York and New Jersey, New York and New Jersey, authorized by section 101(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2576), is modified—

(1) to authorize the Secretary to allow the non-Federal interest to construct a temporary dredged material storage facility to receive dredged material from the project if—

(A) the non-Federal interest submits, in writing, a list of potential sites for the temporary storage facility to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Secretary at least 180 days before the selection of the final site; and

(B) at least 70 percent of the dredged material generated in connection with the project suitable for beneficial reuse will be used at sites in the State of New Jersey to the extent that there are sufficient sites available; and

(2) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of construction of the temporary storage facility for the project.

**SEC. 3124. NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM.**

Section 553(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3781) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘New York State Canal System’ means the 524 miles of navigable canal that comprise the New York State Canal System, including the Erie, Cayuga-Seneca, Oswego, and Champlain Canals and the historic alignments of these canals, including the cities of Albany, Rochester, and Buffalo.”

**SEC. 3125. SUSQUEHANNA RIVER AND UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, NEW YORK.**

(a) **WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the State of New York, the Delaware or Susquehanna River Basin Commission, as appropriate, and local entities, shall develop watershed management plans for the Susquehanna River watershed in New York State and the Upper Delaware River watershed for the purposes of evaluating existing and new flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration.

(2) **EXISTING PLANS.**—In developing the watershed management plans, the Secretary shall use existing studies and plans, as appropriate.

(b) **CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may participate in any eligible critical restoration project in the Susquehanna River or Upper Delaware Rivers in accordance with the watershed management plans developed under subsection (a).

(2) **ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.**—A critical restoration project shall be eligible for assistance under this section if the project—

(A) meets the purposes described in the watershed management plans developed under subsection (a); and

(B) with respect to the Susquehanna River or Upper Delaware River watershed in New York, consists of flood damage reduction or ecosystem restoration through—

(i) bank stabilization of the mainstem, tributaries, and streams;

(ii) wetland restoration;

(iii) soil and water conservation;

(iv) restoration of natural flows;

(v) restoration of stream stability;

(vi) structural and nonstructural flood damage reduction measures; or

(vii) any other project or activity the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into 1 or more cooperative agreements to provide financial assistance to appropriate Federal, State, or local governments or nonprofit agencies, including assistance for the implementation of projects to be carried out under subsection (b).

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**SEC. 3126. MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, NORTH DAKOTA.**

Section 707(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2699) is amended in the first sentence by striking “\$5,000,000” and all that follows through “2005” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

**SEC. 3127. WAHPETON, NORTH DAKOTA.**

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allotted for the project for flood damage reduction, Wahpeton, North Dakota, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be \$12,000,000.

**SEC. 3128. OHIO.**

Section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 381) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), a non-Federal interest for any project carried out under this section may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.”

**SEC. 3129. LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, GIRARD, OHIO.**

Section 507 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3758) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—” before “The Secretary”;

(2) in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “Repair and rehabilitation” and all that follows through “Ohio” and inserting “Correction of structural deficiencies of the Lower Girard Lake Dam, Girard, Ohio, and the appurtenant features to meet the dam safety standards of the State of Ohio”; and

(B) by striking “\$2,500,000” and inserting “\$16,000,000”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **SPECIAL RULES.**—The project for Lower Girard Lake Dam, Girard, Ohio, authorized by subsection (a)(1) is justified on the basis of public safety.”

**SEC. 3130. MAHONING RIVER, OHIO.**

In carrying out the project for environmental dredging, authorized by section 312(f)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1272(f)(4)), the Secretary is directed to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the

project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

#### SEC. 3131. ARCADIA LAKE, OKLAHOMA.

Payments made by the city of Edmond, Oklahoma, to the Secretary in October 1999 of all costs associated with present and future water storage costs at Arcadia Lake, Oklahoma, under Arcadia Lake Water Storage Contract Number DACW56-79-C-0072 shall satisfy the obligations of the city under that contract.

#### SEC. 3132. ARKANSAS RIVER CORRIDOR, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to participate in the ecosystem restoration, recreation, and flood damage reduction components of the Arkansas River Corridor Master Plan dated October 2005. The Secretary shall coordinate with appropriate representatives in the vicinity of Tulsa, Oklahoma, including representatives of Tulsa County and surrounding communities and the Indian Nations Council of Governments.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 3133. LAKE EUFAULA, OKLAHOMA.

(a) PROJECT GOAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The goal for operation of Lake Eufaula, Oklahoma, shall be to maximize the use of available storage in a balanced approach that incorporates advice from representatives from all the project purposes to ensure that the full value of the reservoir is realized by the United States.

(2) RECOGNITION OF PURPOSE.—To achieve the goal described in paragraph (1), recreation is recognized as a project purpose at Lake Eufaula, pursuant to section 4 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 889).

(b) LAKE EUFAULA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Secretary shall establish an advisory committee for the Lake Eufaula, Canadian River, Oklahoma project authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 635).

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the committee shall be advisory only.

(3) DUTIES.—The committee shall provide information and recommendations to the Corps of Engineers regarding the operations of Lake Eufaula for the project purposes for Lake Eufaula.

(4) COMPOSITION.—The Committee shall be composed of members that equally represent the project purposes for Lake Eufaula.

(c) REALLOCATION STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the appropriation of funds, the Secretary shall perform a reallocation study, at Federal expense, to develop and present recommendations concerning the best value, while minimizing ecological damages, for current and future use of the Lake Eufaula storage capacity for the authorized project purposes of flood control, water supply, hydroelectric power, navigation, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

(2) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—The reallocation study shall take into consideration the recommendations of the Lake Eufaula Advisory Committee.

(d) POOL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, to the extent feasible within available project funds and subject to the completion and approval of the reallocation study under subsection (c), the Tulsa district engineer, taking into consideration recommendations of the Lake Eufaula Advisory Committee, shall develop an interim management plan that accommodates all project purposes for Lake Eufaula.

(2) MODIFICATIONS.—A modification of the plan under paragraph (1) shall not cause significant adverse impacts on any existing permit,

lease, license, contract, public law, or project purpose, including flood control operation, relating to Lake Eufaula.

#### SEC. 3134. OKLAHOMA LAKES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement an innovative program at the lakes located primarily in the State of Oklahoma that are a part of an authorized civil works project under the administrative jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers for the purpose of demonstrating the benefits of enhanced recreation facilities and activities at those lakes.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In implementing the program under subsection (a), the Secretary, consistent with authorized project purposes, shall—

(1) pursue strategies that will enhance, to the maximum extent practicable, recreation experiences at the lakes included in the program;

(2) use creative management strategies that optimize recreational activities; and

(3) ensure continued public access to recreation areas located on or associated with the civil works project.

(c) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidelines for the implementation of this section, to be developed in coordination with the State of Oklahoma.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the program under subsection (a).

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a description of the projects undertaken under the program, including—

(A) an estimate of the change in any related recreational opportunities;

(B) a description of any leases entered into, including the parties involved; and

(C) the financial conditions that the Corps of Engineers used to justify those leases.

(3) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall make the report available to the public in electronic and written formats.

(e) TERMINATION.—The authority provided by this section shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 3135. OTTAWA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$30,000,000 for the purposes set forth in subsection (b).

(b) PURPOSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under subsection (a) may be used for the purpose of—

(1) the buyout of properties and permanently relocating residents and businesses in or near Picher, Cardin, and Hockerville, Oklahoma, from areas determined by the State of Oklahoma to be at risk of damage caused by land subsidence and remaining properties; and

(2) providing funding to the State of Oklahoma to buyout properties and permanently relocate residents and businesses of Picher, Cardin, and Hockerville, Oklahoma, from areas determined by the State of Oklahoma to be at risk of damage caused by land subsidence and remaining properties.

(c) LIMITATION.—The use of funds in accordance with subsection (b) shall not be considered to be part of a federally assisted program or project for purposes of Public Law 91-646 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.), consistent with section 2301 of Public Law 109-234 (120 Stat. 455).

(d) CONSISTENCY WITH STATE PROGRAM.—Any actions taken under subsection (b) shall be consistent with the relocation program in the State of Oklahoma under 27A O.S. Supp. 2006, sections 2201 et seq.

(e) CONSIDERATION OF REMEDIAL ACTION.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protec-

tion Agency shall consider, without delay, a remedial action under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) for the Tar Creek, Oklahoma, National Priorities List site that includes permanent relocation of residents consistent with the program currently being administered by the State of Oklahoma. Such relocation shall not be subject to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.).

(f) ESTIMATING COSTS.—In estimating and comparing the cost of a remedial alternative for the Tar Creek Oklahoma, National Priorities List site that includes the permanent relocation of residents, the Administrator shall not include the cost of compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.).

(g) EFFECT OF CERTAIN REMEDIES.—Inclusion of subsidence remedies, such as permanent relocation within any remedial action, shall not preempt, alter, or delay the right of any sovereign entity, including any State or tribal government, to seek remedies, including abatement, for land subsidence and subsidence risks under State law.

(h) AMENDMENT.—Section 111 of Public Law 108-137 (117 Stat. 1835) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following: “Such activities also may include the provision of financial assistance to facilitate the buy out of properties located in areas identified by the State as areas that are or will be at risk of damage caused by land subsidence and associated properties otherwise identified by the State. Any buyout of such properties shall not be considered to be part of a federally assisted program or project for purposes of Public Law 91-646 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.), consistent with section 2301 of Public Law 109-234 (120 Stat. 455-456).”; and

(2) by striking the first sentence of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “Non-Federal interests shall be responsible for operating and maintaining any restoration alternatives constructed or carried out pursuant to this section.”.

#### SEC. 3136. RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL, OKLAHOMA AND TEXAS.

The project for water quality control in the Arkansas and Red River Basin, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1420) and modified by section 1107(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4229) is further modified to direct the Secretary to provide operation and maintenance for the Red River Chloride Control project, Oklahoma and Texas, at Federal expense.

#### SEC. 3137. WAURIKA LAKE, OKLAHOMA.

The remaining obligation of the Waurika Project Master Conservancy District payable to the United States Government in the amounts, rates of interest, and payment schedules—

(1) is set at the amounts, rates of interest, and payment schedules that existed on June 3, 1986, with respect to the project for Waurika Lake, Oklahoma; and

(2) may not be adjusted, altered, or changed without a specific, separate, and written agreement between the District and the United States.

#### SEC. 3138. UPPER WILLAMETTE RIVER WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OREGON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct studies and ecosystem restoration projects for the upper Willamette River watershed from Albany, Oregon, to the headwaters of the Willamette River and tributaries.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall carry out ecosystem restoration projects under this section for the Upper Willamette River watershed in consultation with the Governor of the State of Oregon, the heads of appropriate Indian tribes, the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service,



the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and local entities.

(c) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out ecosystem restoration projects under this section, the Secretary shall undertake activities necessary to protect, monitor, and restore fish and wildlife habitat.

(d) **PRIORITY.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall give priority to a project to restore the millrace in Eugene, Oregon, and shall include noneconomic benefits associated with the historical significance of the millrace and associated with preservation and enhancement of resources in evaluating the benefits of the project.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$15,000,000.

**SEC. 3139. DELAWARE RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA, NEW JERSEY, AND DELAWARE.**

The Secretary may remove debris from the project for navigation, Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, Philadelphia to the Sea.

**SEC. 3140. RAYSTOWN LAKE, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The Secretary may take such action as may be necessary, including construction of a breakwater, to prevent shoreline erosion between .07 and 2.7 miles south of Pennsylvania State Route 994 on the east shore of Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.

**SEC. 3141. SHERADEN PARK STREAM AND CHARTIERS CREEK, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Sheraden Park Stream and Chartiers Creek, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), up to \$400,000 toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3142. SOLOMON'S CREEK, WILKES-BARRE, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The project for flood control, Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124), is modified to include as a project element the project for flood control for Solomon's Creek, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

**SEC. 3143. SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.**

Section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845; 109 Stat. 407; 110 Stat. 3723; 113 Stat. 310; 117 Stat. 142) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(1) by striking “\$180,000,000” and inserting “\$200,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (h)(2) by striking “Allegheny, Armstrong, Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Clearfield, Fayette, Franklin, Fulton, Greene, Huntingdon, Indiana, Juniata, Mifflin, Somerset, Snyder, Washington, and Westmoreland Counties” and inserting “Allegheny, Armstrong, Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Fayette, Franklin, Fulton, Greene, Huntingdon, Indiana, Juniata, Somerset, Washington, and Westmoreland Counties”.

**SEC. 3144. WYOMING VALLEY, PENNSYLVANIA.**

In carrying out the project for flood control, Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124), the Secretary shall coordinate with non-Federal interests to review opportunities for increased public access.

**SEC. 3145. NARRAGANSETT BAY, RHODE ISLAND.**

The Secretary may use amounts in the Environmental Restoration Account, Formerly Used Defense Sites, under section 2703(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, for the removal of abandoned marine mammals at any formerly used de-

fense site under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense that is undergoing (or is scheduled to undergo) environmental remediation under chapter 160 of title 10, United States Code (and other provisions of law), in Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island, in accordance with the Corps of Engineers prioritization process under the Formerly Used Defense Sites program.

**SEC. 3146. MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SOUTH DAKOTA.**

(a) **MEMBERSHIP.**—Section 904(b)(1)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2708) is amended—

(1) in clause (vii) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (ix); and

(3) by inserting after clause (vii) the following:

“(viii) rural water systems; and”.

(b) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 907(a) of such Act (114 Stat. 2712) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2005” and inserting “2010”.

**SEC. 3147. CEDAR BAYOU, TEXAS.**

(a) **CREDIT FOR PLANNING AND DESIGN.**—The project for navigation, Cedar Bayou, Texas, reauthorized by section 349(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2632), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(b) **COST SHARING.**—Cost sharing for construction and operation and maintenance of the project shall be determined in accordance with section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211).

(c) **PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION.**—Section 349(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2632) is amended by striking “12 feet deep by 125 feet wide” and inserting “that is 10 feet deep by 100 feet wide”.

**SEC. 3148. FREEPORT HARBOR, TEXAS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for navigation, Freeport Harbor, Texas, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1818), is modified to provide that—

(1) all project costs incurred as a result of the discovery of the sunken vessel COMSTOCK of the Corps of Engineers are a Federal responsibility; and

(2) the Secretary shall not seek further obligation or responsibility for removal of the vessel COMSTOCK, or costs associated with a delay due to the discovery of the sunken vessel COMSTOCK, from the Port of Freeport.

(b) **COST SHARING.**—This section does not affect the authorized cost sharing for the balance of the project described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 3149. LAKE KEMP, TEXAS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may not take any legal or administrative action seeking to remove a Lake Kemp improvement before the earlier of January 1, 2020, or the date of any transfer of ownership of the improvement occurring after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.**—The United States, or any of its officers, agents, or assignees, shall not be liable for any injury, loss, or damage accruing to the owners of a Lake Kemp improvement, their lessees, or occupants as a result of any flooding or inundation of such improvements by the waters of the Lake Kemp reservoir, or for such injury, loss, or damage as may occur through the operation and maintenance of the Lake Kemp dam and reservoir in any manner.

(c) **LAKE KEMP IMPROVEMENT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Lake Kemp improvement” means an improvement (including dwellings) located within the flowage easement of Lake Kemp, Texas, below elevation 1159 feet mean sea level.

**SEC. 3150. LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TEXAS.**

The project for flood control, Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4125), is modified—

(1) to include as part of the project flood protection works to reroute drainage to Raymondville Drain constructed by the non-Federal interests in Hidalgo County in the vicinity of Edinburg, Texas, if the Secretary determines that such work is feasible;

(2) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project; and

(3) to direct the Secretary in calculating the non-Federal share of the cost of the project, to make a determination, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, under section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)) on the non-Federal interest's ability to pay.

**SEC. 3151. NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TEXAS.**

The project for ecosystem restoration and storm damage reduction, North Padre Island, Corpus Christi Bay, Texas, authorized by section 556 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 353), is modified to include recreation as a project purpose.

**SEC. 3152. PAT MAYSE LAKE, TEXAS.**

The Secretary is directed to accept from the city of Paris, Texas, \$3,461,432 as payment in full of monies owed to the United States for water supply storage space in Pat Mayse Lake, Texas, under contract number DA-34-066-CIVENG-65-1272, including accrued interest.

**SEC. 3153. PROCTOR LAKE, TEXAS.**

The Secretary is authorized to purchase fee simple title to all properties located within the boundaries, and necessary for the operation, of the Proctor Lake project, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1259).

**SEC. 3154. SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.**

The project for flood control, San Antonio Channel, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1259) as part of the comprehensive plan for flood protection on the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers in Texas and modified by section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2921) and section 335 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2611), is modified to authorize the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project.

**SEC. 3155. CONNECTICUT RIVER RESTORATION, VERMONT.**

Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), as in effect on August 5, 2005, with respect to the study entitled “Connecticut River Restoration Authority”, dated May 23, 2001, a nonprofit entity may act as the non-Federal interest for purposes of carrying out the activities described in the agreement executed between The Nature Conservancy and the Department of the Army on August 5, 2005.

**SEC. 3156. DAM REMEDIATION, VERMONT.**

Section 543 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2673) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subsection (a)(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

“(4) may carry out measures to restore, protect, and preserve an ecosystem affected by a dam described in subsection (b).”; and

(4) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following:

- “(11) Camp Wapanacki, Hardwick.
- “(12) Star Lake Dam, Mt. Holly.
- “(13) Curtis Pond, Calais.
- “(14) Weathersfield Reservoir, Springfield.
- “(15) Burr Pond, Sudbury.
- “(16) Maidstone Lake, Guildhall.
- “(17) Upper and Lower Hurricane Dam.
- “(18) Lake Fairlee.
- “(19) West Charleston Dam.
- “(20) White River, Sharon.”.

**SEC. 3157. LAKE CHAMPLAIN EURASIAN MILFOIL, WATER CHESTNUT, AND OTHER NON-NATIVE PLANT CONTROL, VERMONT.**

Under authority of section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610), the Secretary may revise the existing General Design Memorandum to permit the use of chemical means of control, when appropriate, of Eurasian milfoil, water chestnuts, and other non-native plants in the Lake Champlain basin, Vermont.

**SEC. 3158. UPPER CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN WETLAND RESTORATION, VERMONT AND NEW HAMPSHIRE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the States of Vermont and New Hampshire, shall carry out a study and develop a strategy for the use of wetland restoration, soil and water conservation practices, and non-structural measures to reduce flood damage, improve water quality, and create wildlife habitat in the Upper Connecticut River watershed.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In conducting the study and developing the strategy under this section, the Secretary may enter into one or more cooperative agreements to provide technical assistance to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and nonprofit organizations with wetland restoration experience. Such assistance may include assistance for the implementation of wetland restoration projects and soil and water conservation measures.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall carry out development and implementation of the strategy under this section in cooperation with local landowners and local government officials.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**SEC. 3159. UPPER CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, VERMONT AND NEW HAMPSHIRE.**

(a) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and in consultation with the States of Vermont and New Hampshire and the Connecticut River Joint Commission, shall conduct a study and develop a general management plan for ecosystem restoration of the Upper Connecticut River ecosystem for the purposes of—

- (A) habitat protection and restoration;
- (B) streambank stabilization;
- (C) restoration of stream stability;
- (D) water quality improvement;
- (E) aquatic nuisance species control;
- (F) wetland restoration;
- (G) fish passage; and
- (H) natural flow restoration.

(2) EXISTING PLANS.—In developing the general management plan, the Secretary shall depend heavily on existing plans for the restoration of the Upper Connecticut River.

(b) CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in any critical restoration project in the Upper Connecticut River basin in accordance with the general management plan developed under subsection (a).

(2) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—A critical restoration project shall be eligible for assistance under this section if the project—

(A) meets the purposes described in the general management plan developed under subsection (a); and

(B) with respect to the Upper Connecticut River and Upper Connecticut River watershed, consists of—

- (i) bank stabilization of the main stem, tributaries, and streams;
- (ii) wetland restoration and migratory bird habitat restoration;
- (iii) soil and water conservation;
- (iv) restoration of natural flows;
- (v) restoration of stream stability;
- (vi) implementation of an intergovernmental agreement for coordinating ecosystem restoration, fish passage installation, streambank stabilization, wetland restoration, habitat protection and restoration, or natural flow restoration;

(vii) water quality improvement;

(viii) aquatic nuisance species control;

(ix) improvements in fish migration; and

(x) conduct of any other project or activity determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into one or more cooperative agreements to provide financial assistance to appropriate Federal, State, or local governments or nonprofit agencies. Such assistance may include assistance for the implementation of projects to be carried out under subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

**SEC. 3160. LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED, VERMONT AND NEW YORK.**

Section 542 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2671) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) river corridor assessment, protection, management, and restoration for the purposes of ecosystem restoration;

“(F) geographic mapping conducted by the Secretary using existing technical capacity to produce a high-resolution, multispectral satellite imagery-based land use and cover data set; or”;

(2) in subsection (e)(2)(A)—

(A) by striking “The non-Federal” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) APPROVAL OF DISTRICT ENGINEER.—Approval of credit for design work of less than \$100,000 shall be determined by the appropriate district engineer.”;

(3) in subsection (e)(2)(C) by striking “up to 50 percent of”; and

(4) in subsection (g) by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$32,000,000”.

**SEC. 3161. SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.**

The project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Sandbridge Beach, Virginia Beach, Virginia, authorized by section 101(22) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4804) and modified by section 338 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2612), is modified to authorize the Secretary to review the project to determine whether any additional Federal interest exists with respect to the project, taking into consideration conditions and development levels relating to the project in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 3162. TANGIER ISLAND SEAWALL, VIRGINIA.**

Section 577(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3789) is amended by striking “at a total cost of \$1,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$900,000 and an esti-

mated non-Federal cost of \$300,000.” and inserting “at a total cost of \$3,600,000.”.

**SEC. 3163. DUWAMISH/GREEN, WASHINGTON.**

The project for ecosystem restoration, Duwamish/Green, Washington, authorized by section 101(b)(26) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2579), is modified—

(1) to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project; and

(2) to authorize the non-Federal interest to provide any portion of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project in the form of in-kind services and materials.

**SEC. 3164. MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, MCNARY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO.**

(a) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land acquired for the McNary Lock and Dam project and managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service under cooperative agreement number DACW68–4–00–13 with the Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District, is transferred from the Secretary to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) EASEMENTS.—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction under paragraph (1) shall be subject to easements in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act on land subject to the transfer.

(c) RIGHTS OF SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall retain rights described in subparagraph (B) with respect to the land for which administrative jurisdiction is transferred under paragraph (1).

(2) RIGHTS.—The rights of the Secretary referred to in paragraph (1) are the rights—

(A) to flood land described in subsection (a) to the standard project flood elevation;

(B) to manipulate the level of the McNary project pool;

(C) to access land described in subsection (a) as may be required to install, maintain, and inspect sediment ranges and carry out similar activities;

(D) to construct and develop wetland, riparian habitat, or other environmental restoration features authorized by section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) and section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330);

(E) to dredge and deposit fill materials; and

(F) to carry out management actions for the purpose of reducing the take of juvenile salmonids by avian colonies that inhabit, before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, any island included in the land described in subsection (a).

(3) COORDINATION.—Before exercising a right described in any of subparagraphs (C) through (F) of paragraph (2), the Secretary shall coordinate the exercise with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(d) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The land described in subsection (a) shall be managed by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the McNary National Wildlife Refuge.

(2) CUMMINS PROPERTY.—

(A) RETENTION OF CREDITS.—Habitat unit credits described in the memorandum entitled “Design Memorandum No. 6, LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION PLAN, Wildlife Compensation and Fishing Access Site Selection, Letter Supplement No. 15, SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE WALLULA HMU” provided for the Lower Snake River Fish and Wildlife Compensation Plan through development of the parcel of land formerly known as the “Cummins property” shall be retained by the Secretary despite any

changes in management of the parcel on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.**—The Director shall obtain prior approval of the Washington State department of fish and wildlife for any change to the previously approved site development plan for the parcel of land formerly known as the “Cummins property”.

(3) **MADAME DORIAN RECREATION AREA.**—The Director shall continue operation of the Madame Dorian Recreation Area for public use and boater access.

(e) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The Director shall be responsible for all survey, environmental compliance, and other administrative costs required to implement the transfer of administrative jurisdiction under subsection (a).

**SEC. 3165. SNAKE RIVER PROJECT, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The fish and wildlife compensation plan for the Lower Snake River, Washington and Idaho, as authorized by section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2921), is amended to authorize the Secretary to conduct studies and implement aquatic and riparian ecosystem restorations and improvements specifically for fisheries and wildlife.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 3166. YAKIMA RIVER, PORT OF SUNNYSIDE, WASHINGTON.**

The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Yakima River, Port of Sunnyside, Washington, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), is modified to direct the Secretary to credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 3167. BLUESTONE LAKE, OHIO RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA.**

Section 102(ff) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4810, 110 Stat. 3726, 113 Stat. 312) is amended to read as follows:

“(ff) **BLUESTONE LAKE, OHIO RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for flood control, Bluestone Lake, Ohio River Basin, West Virginia, authorized by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1217) is modified to direct the Secretary to implement Plan C/G, as defined in the Evaluation Report of the District Engineer dated December 1996, to prohibit the release of drift and debris into waters downstream of the project (other than organic matter necessary to maintain and enhance the biological resources of such waters and such nonobtrusive items of debris as may not be economically feasible to prevent being released through such project), including measures to prevent the accumulation of drift and debris at the project, the collection and removal of drift and debris on the segment of the New River upstream of the project, and the removal (through use of temporary or permanent systems) and disposal of accumulated drift and debris at Bluestone Dam.

“(2) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.**—In carrying out the downstream cleanup under the plan referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the West Virginia department of environmental protection for the department to carry out the cleanup, including contracting and procurement services, contract administration and management, transportation and disposal of collected materials, and disposal fees.

“(3) **INITIAL CLEANUP.**—The Secretary may provide the West Virginia department of environmental protection up to \$150,000 from funds previously appropriated for this purpose for the Federal share of the costs of the initial cleanup under the plan.”.

**SEC. 3168. GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA.**

Section 579(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790; 113 Stat. 312) is amended by striking “\$47,000,000” and inserting “\$99,000,000”.

**SEC. 3169. LESAGE/GREENBOTTOM SWAMP, WEST VIRGINIA.**

Section 30(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4030; 114 Stat. 2678) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **HISTORIC STRUCTURE.**—The Secretary shall ensure the preservation and restoration of the structure known as the ‘Jenkins House’ and the reconstruction of associated buildings and landscape features of such structure located within the Lesage/Greenbottom Swamp in accordance with the standards of the Department of the Interior for the treatment of historic properties. Amounts made available for expenditure for the project authorized by section 301(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4110) shall be available for the purposes of this subsection.”.

**SEC. 3170. LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WEST VIRGINIA.**

The project for flood control at Milton, West Virginia, authorized by section 580 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790) and modified by section 340 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2612), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the draft report of the Corps of Engineers dated May 2004, at an estimated total cost of \$57,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$42,825,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$14,275,000.

**SEC. 3171. MCDOWELL COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA.**

The McDowell County nonstructural component of the project for flood control, Levisa and Tug Fork of the Big Sandy and Cumberland Rivers, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky, authorized by section 202(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1339), is modified to direct the Secretary to take measures to provide protection, throughout McDowell County, West Virginia, from the recurrence of the greater of—

- (1) the April 1977 flood;
- (2) the July 2001 flood;
- (3) the May 2002 flood; or
- (4) the 100-year frequency event.

**SEC. 3172. PARKERSBURG, WEST VIRGINIA.**

The Secretary is authorized to carry out the ecosystem restoration, recreation, and flood control components of the report of the Corps of Engineers, entitled “Parkersburg/Vienna Riverfront Park Feasibility Study”, dated June 1998, as amended by the limited reevaluation report of the Corps of Engineers, dated March 2004, at a total cost of \$12,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$6,000,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,000,000.

**SEC. 3173. GREEN BAY HARBOR, GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN.**

The portion of the inner harbor of the Federal navigation channel of the Green Bay Harbor project, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled “An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. 136), from Station 190+00 to Station 378+00 is authorized to a width of 75 feet and a depth of 6 feet.

**SEC. 3174. MANITOWOC HARBOR, WISCONSIN.**

The project for navigation, Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1852 (10 Stat. 58), is modified to direct the Secretary to deepen the upstream reach of the navigation channel from 12 feet to 18 feet, at a total cost of \$405,000.

**SEC. 3175. MISSISSIPPI RIVER HEADWATERS RESERVOIRS.**

Section 21 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4027) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “1276.42” and inserting “1278.42”;

(B) by striking “1218.31” and inserting “1221.31”;

(C) by striking “1234.82” and inserting “1235.30”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary may operate the headwaters reservoirs below the minimum or above the maximum water levels established in subsection (a) in accordance with water control regulation manuals (or revisions thereto) developed by the Secretary, after consultation with the Governor of Minnesota and affected tribal governments, landowners, and commercial and recreational users. The water control regulation manuals (and any revisions thereto) shall be effective when the Secretary transmits them to Congress. The Secretary shall report to Congress at least 14 days before operating any such headwaters reservoir below the minimum or above the maximum water level limits specified in subsection (a); except that notification is not required for operations necessary to prevent the loss of life or to ensure the safety of the dam or if the drawdown of lake levels is in anticipation of flood control operations.”.

**SEC. 3176. UPPER BASIN OF MISSOURI RIVER.**

(a) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–103), funds made available for recovery or mitigation activities in the lower basin of the Missouri River may be used for recovery or mitigation activities in the upper basin of the Missouri River, including the States of Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The matter under the heading “MISSOURI RIVER MITIGATION, MISSOURI, KANSAS, IOWA, AND NEBRASKA” of section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4143), as modified by section 334 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 306), is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary may carry out any recovery or mitigation activities in the upper basin of the Missouri River, including the States of Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota, using funds made available under this paragraph in accordance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and consistent with the project purposes of the Missouri River Mainstem System as authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 897).”.

**SEC. 3177. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.**

Section 1103(e)(1)(A)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including research on water quality issues affecting the Mississippi River (including elevated nutrient levels) and the development of remediation strategies”.

**SEC. 3178. UPPER OHIO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES NAVIGATION SYSTEM NEW TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM.**

(a) **UPPER OHIO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES NAVIGATION SYSTEM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Upper Ohio River and Tributaries navigation system” means the Allegheny, Kanawha, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to evaluate new technologies applicable to the Upper Ohio River and Tributaries navigation system.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—The program may include the design, construction, or implementation of innovative technologies and solutions for the Upper Ohio River and Tributaries navigation system, including projects for—

(A) improved navigation;

- (B) environmental stewardship;
- (C) increased navigation reliability; and
- (D) reduced navigation costs.

(3) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the program shall be—

(A) to increase the reliability and availability of federally owned and federally operated navigation facilities;

- (B) to decrease system operational risks; and
- (C) to improve—
  - (i) vessel traffic management;
  - (ii) access; and
  - (iii) Federal asset management.

(c) **FEDERAL OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is federally owned.

(d) **LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall enter into local cooperation agreements with non-Federal interests to provide for the design, construction, installation, and operation of the projects to be carried out under the program.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a navigation improvement project, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) **LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.**—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—Total project costs under each local cooperation agreement shall be cost-shared in accordance with the formula relating to the applicable original construction project.

(4) **EXPENDITURES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Expenditures under the program may include, for establishment at federally owned property, such as locks, dams, and bridges—

- (i) transmitters;
- (ii) responders;
- (iii) hardware;
- (iv) software; and
- (v) wireless networks.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—Transmitters, responders, hardware, software, and wireless networks and other equipment installed on privately owned vessels or equipment shall not be eligible under the program.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2008, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether the program or any component of the program should be implemented on a national basis.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,100,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

#### **SEC. 3179. CONTINUATION OF PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)), the following projects shall remain authorized to be carried out by the Secretary:

(1) The project for navigation, Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, California, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4092).

(2) The project for flood control, Agaña River, Guam, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4127).

(3) The project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland and Virginia, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1818).

(4) The project for navigation, Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731); except that the authorized depth of that portion

of the project extending riverward of the Charles M. Braga, Jr. Memorial Bridge, Fall River and Somerset, Massachusetts, shall not exceed 35 feet.

(5) The project for flood control, Ecorse Creek, Wayne County, Michigan, authorized by section 101(a)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4607).

(b) **LIMITATION.**—A project described in subsection (a) shall not be authorized for construction after the last day of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, unless, during such period, funds have been obligated for the construction (including planning and design) of the project.

#### **SEC. 3180. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.**

Each of the following projects may be carried out by the Secretary and no construction on any such project may be initiated until the Secretary determines that the project is feasible:

(1) **MEMONINEE HARBOR AND RIVER, MICHIGAN AND WISCONSIN.**—The project for navigation, Menominee Harbor and River, Michigan and Wisconsin, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 482) and deauthorized on April 15, 2002, in accordance with section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)).

(2) **HEARDING ISLAND INLET, DULUTH HARBOR, MINNESOTA.**—The project for dredging, Hearing Island Inlet, Duluth Harbor, Minnesota, authorized by section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4027).

(3) **MANITOWOC HARBOR, WISCONSIN.**—That portion of the project for navigation, Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1852 (10 Stat. 58), consisting of the channel in the south part of the outer harbor, deauthorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1176).

#### **SEC. 3181. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The following projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) **BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 919), consisting of an 18-foot channel in Yellow Mill River and described as follows: Beginning at a point along the eastern limit of the existing project, N123,649.75, E481,920.54, thence running northwesterly about 52.64 feet to a point N123,683.03, E481,879.75, thence running northeasterly about 1,442.21 feet to a point N125,030.08, E482,394.96, thence running northeasterly about 139.52 feet to a point along the eastern limit of the existing channel, N125,133.87, E482,488.19, thence running southwesterly about 1,588.98 feet to the point of origin.

(2) **MYSTIC RIVER, CONNECTICUT.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Mystic River, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of September 19, 1890 (26 Stat. 436) consisting of a 12-foot-deep channel, approximately 7,554 square feet in area, starting at a point N193,086.51, E815,092.78, thence running north 59 degrees 21 minutes 46.63 seconds west about 138.05 feet to a point N193,156.86, E814,974.00, thence running north 51 degrees 04 minutes 39.00 seconds west about 166.57 feet to a point N193,261.51, E814,844.41, thence running north 43 degrees 01 minutes 34.90 seconds west about 86.23 feet to a point N193,324.55, E814,785.57, thence running north 06 degrees 42 minutes 03.86 seconds west about 156.57 feet to a point N193,480.05, E814,767.30, thence running south 21 degrees 21 minutes 17.94 seconds east about 231.42 feet to a point N193,264.52, E814,851.57, thence running south 53 degrees 34 minutes 23.28 seconds east about 299.78 feet to the point of origin.

(3) **NORWALK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The portions of a 10-foot channel of the project for navigation, Norwalk

Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1276) and described in subparagraph (B).

(B) **DESCRIPTION OF PORTIONS.**—The portions of the channel referred to in subparagraph (A) are as follows:

(i) **RECTANGULAR PORTION.**—An approximately rectangular-shaped section along the northwesterly terminus of the channel. The section is 35-foot wide and about 460-feet long and is further described as commencing at a point N104,165.85, E417,662.71, thence running south 24 degrees 06 minutes 55 seconds east 395.00 feet to a point N103,805.32, E417,824.10, thence running south 00 degrees 38 minutes 06 seconds east 87.84 feet to a point N103,717.49, E417,825.07, thence running north 24 degrees 06 minutes 55 seconds west 480.00 feet, to a point N104,155.59, E417,628.96, thence running north 73 degrees 05 minutes 25 seconds east 35.28 feet to the point of origin.

(ii) **PARALLELOGRAM-SHAPED PORTION.**—An area having the approximate shape of a parallelogram along the northeasterly portion of the channel, southeast of the area described in clause (i), approximately 20 feet wide and 260 feet long, and further described as commencing at a point N103,855.48, E417,849.99, thence running south 33 degrees 07 minutes 30 seconds east 133.40 feet to a point N103,743.76, E417,922.89, thence running south 24 degrees 07 minutes 04 seconds east 127.75 feet to a point N103,627.16, E417,975.09, thence running north 33 degrees 07 minutes 30 seconds west 190.00 feet to a point N103,786.28, E417,871.26, thence running north 17 degrees 05 minutes 15 seconds west 72.39 feet to the point of origin.

(C) **EXCLUSION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Secretary shall realign the 10-foot channel portion of the project referred to in subparagraph (A) to include, immediately north of the area described in subparagraph (B)(ii), a triangular section described as commencing at a point N103,968.35, E417,815.29, thence running south 17 degrees 05 minutes 15 seconds east 118.09 feet to a point N103,855.48, E417,849.99, thence running north 33 degrees 07 minutes 30 seconds west 36.76 feet to a point N103,886.27, E417,829.90, thence running north 10 degrees 05 minutes 26 seconds west 83.37 feet to the point of origin.

(4) **ROCKLAND HARBOR, MAINE.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Rockland Harbor, Maine, authorized by the Act of June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 202), consisting of a 14-foot channel located in Lermond Cove and beginning at a point with coordinates N99,977.37, E340,290.02, thence running easterly about 200.00 feet to a point with coordinates N99,978.49, E340,490.02, thence running northerly about 138.00 feet to a point with coordinates N100,116.49, E340,289.25, thence running westerly about 200.00 feet to a point with coordinates N100,115.37, E340,289.25, thence running southerly about 138.00 feet to the point of origin.

(5) **ROCKPORT HARBOR, MAINE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The portion of the project for navigation, Rockport Harbor, Maine, authorized by the first section of the Act of August 11, 1888 (25 Stat. 400), located within the 12-foot anchorage described in subparagraph (B).

(B) **DESCRIPTION OF ANCHORAGE.**—The anchorage referred to in subparagraph (A) is more particularly described as—

(i) beginning at the westernmost point of the anchorage at N128800.00, E349311.00;

(ii) thence running north 12 degrees, 52 minutes, 37.2 seconds east 127.08 feet to a point N128923.88, E349339.32;

(iii) thence running north 17 degrees, 40 minutes, 13.0 seconds east 338.61 feet to a point N129246.51, E349442.10;

(iv) thence running south 89 degrees, 21 minutes, 21.0 seconds east 45.36 feet to a point N129246.00, E349487.46;

(v) thence running south 44 degrees, 13 minutes, 32.6 seconds east 18.85 feet to a point N129232.49, E349500.61;

(vi) thence running south 17 degrees, 40 minutes 13.0 seconds west 340.50 feet to a point N128908.06, E349397.25;

(vii) thence running south 12 degrees, 52 minutes, 37.2 seconds west 235.41 feet to a point at N128678.57, E349344.79; and

(viii) thence running north 15 degrees, 32 minutes, 59.3 seconds west 126.04 feet to the point of origin.

(6) FALMOUTH HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Falmouth Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1172), beginning at a point along the eastern side of the inner harbor N200,415.05, E845,307.98, thence running north 25 degrees 48 minutes 54.3 seconds east 160.24 feet to a point N200,559.20, E845,377.76, thence running north 22 degrees 7 minutes 52.4 seconds east 596.82 feet to a point N201,112.15, E845,602.60, thence running north 60 degrees 1 minute 0.3 seconds east 83.18 feet to a point N201,153.72, E845,674.65, thence running south 24 degrees 56 minutes 43.4 seconds west 665.01 feet to a point N200,550.75, E845,394.18, thence running south 32 degrees 25 minutes 29.0 seconds west 160.76 feet to the point of origin.

(7) ISLAND END RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Island End River, Massachusetts, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), described as follows: Beginning at a point along the eastern limit of the existing project, N507,348.98, E721,180.01, thence running northeast about 35 feet to a point N507,384.17, E721,183.36, thence running northeast about 324 feet to a point N507,590.51, E721,433.17, thence running northeast about 345 feet to a point along the northern limit of the existing project, N507,927.29, E721,510.29, thence running southeast about 25 feet to a point N507,921.71, E721,534.66, thence running southwest about 354 feet to a point N507,576.65, E721,455.64, thence running southwest about 357 feet to the point of origin.

(8) CITY WATERWAY, TACOMA, WASHINGTON.—The portion of the project for navigation, City Waterway, Tacoma, Washington, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of June 13, 1902 (32 Stat. 347), consisting of the last 1,000 linear feet of the inner portion of the waterway beginning at station 70+00 and ending at station 80+00.

(9) AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MASSACHUSETTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for navigation, Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts, constructed under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), consisting of the 8-foot deep anchorage in the cove described in subparagraph (B).

(B) DESCRIPTION OF PORTION.—The portion of the project described in subparagraph (A) is more particularly described as the portion beginning at a point along the southern limit of the existing project, N254,332.00, E1,023,103.96, thence running northwesterly about 761.60 feet to a point along the western limit of the existing project N255,076.84, E1,022,945.07, thence running southwesterly about 38.11 feet to a point N255,038.99, E1,022,940.60, thence running southeasterly about 267.07 feet to a point N254,772.00, E1,022,947.00, thence running southeasterly about 462.41 feet to a point N254,320.06, E1,023,044.84, thence running northeasterly about 60.31 feet to the point of origin.

(10) WHATCOM CREEK WATERWAY, BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON.—The portion of the project for navigation, Whatcom Creek Waterway, Bellingham, Washington, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 664), and section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 299), consisting of the last 2,900 linear feet of the inner portion of the waterway and beginning at station 29+00 to station 0+00.

(11) OCONTO HARBOR, WISCONSIN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for navigation, Oconto Harbor, Wisconsin, au-

thorized by the Act of August 2, 1882 (22 Stat. 196), and the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 664) (commonly known as the "River and Harbor Act of 1910"), consisting of a 15-foot-deep turning basin in the Oconto River, as described in subparagraph (B).

(B) PROJECT DESCRIPTION.—The project referred to in subparagraph (B) is more particularly described as—

(i) beginning at a point along the western limit of the existing project, N394,086.71, E2,530,202.71;

(ii) thence northeasterly about 619.93 feet to a point N394,459.10, E2,530,698.33;

(iii) thence southeasterly about 186.06 feet to a point N394,299.20, E2,530,793.47;

(iv) thence southwesterly about 355.07 feet to a point N393,967.13, E2,530,667.76;

(v) thence southwesterly about 304.10 feet to a point N393,826.90, E2,530,397.92; and

(vi) thence northwesterly about 324.97 feet to the point of origin.

(b) ANCHORAGE AREA, NEW LONDON HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—The portion of the project for navigation, New London Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of June 13, 1902 (32 Stat. 333), that consists of a 23-foot waterfront channel and that is further described as beginning at a point along the western limit of the existing project, N188, 802.75, E779, 462.81, thence running northeasterly about 1,373.88 feet to a point N189, 554.87, E780, 612.53, thence running southeasterly about 439.54 feet to a point N189, 319.88, E780, 983.98, thence running southwesterly about 831.58 feet to a point N188, 864.63, E780, 288.08, thence running southeasterly about 567.39 feet to a point N188, 301.88, E780, 360.49, thence running northwesterly about 1,027.96 feet to the point of origin, is redesignated as an anchorage area.

(c) SOUTHPORT HARBOR, FAIRFIELD, CONNECTICUT.—The project for navigation, Southport Harbor, Fairfield, Connecticut, authorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1829, and by the first section of the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1029), and section 364 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3733–3734), is modified to redesignate a portion of the 9-foot-deep channel to an anchorage area, approximately 900 feet in length and 90,000 square feet in area, and lying generally north of a line with points at coordinates N108,043.45, E452,252.04 and N107,938.74, E452,265.74.

(d) SACO RIVER, MAINE.—The portion of the project for navigation, Saco River, Maine, constructed under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) and described as a 6-foot deep, 10-acre maneuvering basin located at the head of navigation, is redesignated as an anchorage area.

(e) UNION RIVER, MAINE.—The project for navigation, Union River, Maine, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 215), is modified by redesignating as an anchorage area that portion of the project consisting of a 6-foot turning basin and lying northerly of a line commencing at a point N315,975.13, E1,004,424.86, thence running north 61 degrees 27 minutes 20.71 seconds west about 132.34 feet to a point N316,038.37, E1,004,308.61.

(f) MYSTIC RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Mystic River, Massachusetts, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of July 13, 1892 (27 Stat. 96), between a line starting at a point N515,683.77, E707,035.45 and ending at a point N515,721.28, E707,069.85 and a line starting at a point N514,595.15, E707,746.15 and ending at a point N514,732.94, E707,658.38 shall be relocated and reduced from a 100-foot wide channel to a 50-foot wide channel after the date of enactment of this Act described as follows: Beginning at a point N515,721.28, E707,069.85, thence running southeasterly about 840.50 feet to a point N515,070.16, E707,601.27, thence running southeasterly about 177.54 feet to a point

N514,904.84, E707,665.98, thence running southeasterly about 319.90 feet to a point with coordinates N514,595.15, E707,746.15, thence running northwesterly about 163.37 feet to a point N514,732.94, E707,658.38, thence running northwesterly about 161.58 feet to a point N514,889.47, E707,618.30, thence running northwesterly about 166.61 feet to a point N515,044.62, E707,557.58, thence running northwesterly about 825.31 feet to a point N515,683.77, E707,035.45, thence running northeasterly about 50.90 feet returning to a point N515,721.28, E707,069.85.

(g) RIVERCENTER, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 38(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 59j-1; 102 Stat. 4038) is amended by striking "subsection (a) of this section" and inserting "subsection (a) (except 30 years from such date of enactment, in the case of the area or any part thereof described in subsection (a)(5))".

(h) ADDITIONAL DEAUTHORIZATIONS.—The following projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act, except with respect to any portion of such a project which portion has been completed before such date or is under construction on such date:

(1) The project for flood protection on Atascadero Creek and its tributaries of Goleta, California, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1826).

(2) The project for the construction of bridge fenders for the Summit and St. Georges Bridge for the Inland Waterway of the Delaware River to the C & D Canal of the Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1249).

(3) The project for flood control, central and southern Florida, Shingle Creek basin, Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1182).

(4) The project for flood control, Brevoort, Indiana, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1587).

(5) The project for flood control, Middle Wash, Greenfield Bayou, Indiana, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 649).

(6) The project for flood damage reduction, Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, authorized by section 602(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148).

(7) The project for navigation at the Muscatine Harbor on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 166).

(8) The project for flood control and water supply, Eagle Creek Lake, Kentucky, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1188).

(9) The project for flood control, Hazard, Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (100 Stat. 4014) and section 108 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4621).

(10) The project for flood control, western Kentucky tributaries, Kentucky, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1076) and modified by section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1829).

(11) The project for flood damage reduction, Tensas-Cocodrie area, Louisiana, authorized by section 3 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 643).

(12) The uncompleted portions of the project for navigation improvement for Bayou LaFourche and LaFourche Jump, Louisiana, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1033), and the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 481).

(13) The project for flood control, Eastern Rapides and South-Central Avoyelles Parishes, Louisiana, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1825).

(14) The project for erosion protection and recreation, Fort Livingston, Grande Terre Island, Louisiana, authorized by the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426e et seq.).



(15) The project for navigation, Northeast Harbor, Maine, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 12).

(16) The project for navigation, Tenants Harbor, Maine, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1275).

(17) The project for navigation, New York Harbor and adjacent channels, Claremont Terminal, Jersey City, New Jersey, authorized by section 202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098).

(18) The project for navigation, Olcott Harbor, Lake Ontario, New York, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4143).

(19) The project for navigation, Outer Harbor, Buffalo, New York, authorized by section 110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4817).

(20) The project for the Columbia River, Seafarers Memorial, Hammond, Oregon, authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991 (104 Stat. 2078).

(21) The project for navigation, Narragansett Town Beach, Narragansett, Rhode Island, authorized by section 361 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4861).

(22) The project for bulkhead repairs, Quonset Point-Davisville, Rhode Island, authorized by section 571 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3788).

(23) The structural portion of the project for flood control, Cypress Creek, Texas, authorized by section 3(a)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4014).

(24) The project for flood protection, East Fork Channel Improvement, Increment 2, East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185).

(25) The project for flood control, Falfurrias, Texas, authorized by section 3(a)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4014).

(26) The project for flood control, Pecan Bayou Lake, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 742).

(27) The project for navigation improvements affecting Lake of the Pines, Texas, for the portion of the Red River below Fulton, Arkansas, authorized by the Act of July 13, 1892 (27 Stat. 103) and modified by the Act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 635), the Act of May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), and the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731).

(28) The project for navigation, Tennessee Colony Lake, Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 204 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1091).

(29) The project for streambank erosion, Kanawha River, Charleston, West Virginia, authorized by section 603(f)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4153).

#### SEC. 3182. LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) ST. FRANCIS BASIN, ARKANSAS AND MISSOURI.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the State of Arkansas, without monetary consideration and subject to paragraph (2), all right, title, and interest in and to real property within the State acquired by the Federal Government as mitigation land for the project for flood control, St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri Project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928 (33 U.S.C. 702a et seq.).

##### (2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance by the United States under this subsection shall be subject to—

(i) the condition that the State of Arkansas agree to operate, maintain, and manage the real property for fish and wildlife, recreation, and environmental purposes at no cost or expense to the United States; and

(ii) such other terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the interest of the United States.

(B) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the real property conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be held in public ownership or the State ceases to operate, maintain, and manage the real property in accordance with this subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert to the United States, at the option of the Secretary.

(3) MITIGATION.—Nothing in this subsection extinguishes the responsibility of the Federal Government or the non-Federal interest for the project referred to in paragraph (1) from the obligation to implement mitigation for such project that existed on the day prior to the transfer authorized by this subsection.

(b) OAKLAND INNER HARBOR TIDAL CANAL, CALIFORNIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may convey, by separate quitclaim deeds, as soon as the conveyance of each individual portion is practicable, the title of the United States in and to all or portions of the approximately 86 acres of upland, tideland, and submerged land, commonly referred to as the "Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal", California (referred to in this section as the "Canal Property"), as follows:

(A) To the city of Oakland, without consideration, the title of the United States in and to all or portions of that part of the Canal Property that are located within the boundaries of the City of Oakland.

(B) To the city of Alameda, or to a public entity created by or designated by the city of Alameda that is eligible to hold title to real property, without consideration, the title of the United States in and to all or portions of that part of the Canal Property that are located within the boundaries of the city of Alameda.

(C) To the owners of lands adjacent to the Canal Property, or to a public entity created by or designated by one or more of the adjacent land owners that are eligible to hold title to real property, at fair market value, the title of the United States in and to all or portions of that part of the Canal Property that are located within the boundaries of the city in which the adjacent land is located.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may reserve and retain from any conveyance under this subsection a right-of-way or other rights as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the authorized Federal channel in the Canal Property.

(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Until the date on which each conveyance described in paragraph (1) is complete, the Secretary shall submit, by not later than November 30 of each year, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an annual report that describes the efforts of the Secretary to complete that conveyance during the preceding fiscal year.

(4) FORM.—A conveyance made under this subsection may be, in whole or in part, in the form of an easement.

(5) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—For any property on which an easement is granted under this subsection, should the Secretary seek to dispose of the property, the holder of the easement shall have the right of first refusal to the property without cost or consideration.

(6) REPEAL.—Section 205 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4633; 110 Stat. 3748) is repealed.

(c) MILFORD, KANSAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed without consideration to the Geary County Fire Department, Milford, Kansas, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real property consisting of approximately 7.4 acres located in Geary County, Kansas, for construction, operation, and maintenance of a fire station.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the real property conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be held in public ownership or ceases to be operated and maintained as a

fire station, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert to the United States, at the option of the United States.

(d) STRAWN CEMETERY, JOHN REDMOND LAKE, KANSAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Tulsa District of the Corps of Engineers, shall transfer to Pleasant Township, Coffey County, Kansas, for use as the New Strawn Cemetery, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3).

(2) REVERSION.—If the land transferred under this subsection ceases at any time to be used as a nonprofit cemetery or for another public purpose, the land shall revert to the United States.

(3) DESCRIPTION.—The land to be conveyed under this subsection is a tract of land near John Redmond Lake, Kansas, containing approximately 3 acres and lying adjacent to the west line of the Strawn Cemetery located in the SE corner of the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 32, township 20 south, range 14 east, Coffey County, Kansas.

(e) PIKE COUNTY, MISSOURI.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

(A) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means the 2 parcels of Corps of Engineers land totaling approximately 42 acres, located on Buffalo Island in Pike County, Missouri, and consisting of Government Tract Numbers MIS-7 and a portion of FM-46.

(B) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means the approximately 42 acres of land, subject to any existing flowage easements situated in Pike County, Missouri, upstream and northwest, about 200 feet from Drake Island (also known as Grimes Island).

(2) LAND EXCHANGE.—Subject to paragraph (3), on conveyance by S.S.S., Inc., to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to S.S.S., Inc., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(3) CONDITIONS.—

(A) DEEDS.—

(i) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The conveyance of the non-Federal land to the Secretary shall be by a warranty deed acceptable to the Secretary.

(ii) FEDERAL LAND.—The conveyance of the Federal land to S.S.S., Inc., shall be—

(I) by quitclaim deed; and

(II) subject to any reservations, terms, and conditions that the Secretary determines to be necessary to allow the United States to operate and maintain the Mississippi River 9-Foot Navigation Project.

(iii) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The Secretary shall provide a legal description of the Federal land, and S.S.S., Inc., shall provide a legal description of the non-Federal land, for inclusion in the deeds referred to in clauses (i) and (ii).

(B) REMOVAL OF IMPROVEMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may require the removal of, or S.S.S., Inc., may voluntarily remove, any improvements to the non-Federal land before the completion of the exchange or as a condition of the exchange.

(ii) NO LIABILITY.—If S.S.S., Inc., removes any improvements to the non-Federal land under clause (i)—

(I) S.S.S., Inc., shall have no claim against the United States relating to the removal; and

(II) the United States shall not incur or be liable for any cost associated with the removal or relocation of the improvements.

(C) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require S.S.S., Inc. to pay reasonable administrative costs associated with the exchange.

(D) CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.—If the appraised fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the Federal land exceeds the appraised fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the non-Federal land, S.S.S., Inc., shall make a cash equalization payment to the United States.

(E) DEADLINE.—The land exchange under subparagraph (B) shall be completed not later



than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) UNION LAKE, MISSOURI.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall offer to convey to the State of Missouri, before June 30, 2007, all right, title, and interest in and to approximately 205.50 acres of land described in paragraph (2) purchased for the Union Lake Project that was deauthorized as of January 1, 1990 (55 Fed. Reg. 40906), in accordance with section 1001(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)).

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land referred to in paragraph (1) is described as follows:

(A) TRACT 500.—A tract of land situated in Franklin County, Missouri, being part of the SW¼ of section 7, and the NW¼ of the SW¼ of section 8, township 42 north, range 2 west of the fifth principal meridian, consisting of approximately 112.50 acres.

(B) TRACT 605.—A tract of land situated in Franklin County, Missouri, being part of the N½ of the NE, and part of the SE of the NE of section 18, township 42 north, range 2 west of the fifth principal meridian, consisting of approximately 93.00 acres.

(3) CONVEYANCE.—On acceptance by the State of Missouri of the offer by the Secretary under paragraph (1), the land described in paragraph (2) shall immediately be conveyed, in its current condition, by Secretary to the State of Missouri.

(g) BOARDMAN, OREGON.—Section 501(g)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3751) is amended—

(1) by striking “city of Boardman,” and inserting “the Boardman Park and Recreation District, Boardman,”; and

(2) by striking “such city” and inserting “the city of Boardman”.

(h) LOOKOUT POINT PROJECT, LOWELL, OREGON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may convey without consideration to Lowell School District, by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to land and buildings thereon, known as Tract A-82, located in Lowell, Oregon, and described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The parcel of land authorized to be conveyed under paragraph (1) is as follows: Commencing at the point of intersection of the west line of Pioneer Street with the westerly extension of the north line of Summit Street, in Meadows Addition to Lowell, as platted and recorded at page 56 of Volume 4, Lane County Oregon Plat Records; thence north on the west line of Pioneer Street a distance of 176.0 feet to the true point of beginning of this description; thence north on the west line of Pioneer Street a distance of 170.0 feet; thence west at right angles to the west line of Pioneer Street a distance of 250.0 feet; thence south and parallel to the west line of Pioneer Street a distance of 170.0 feet; thence east 250.0 feet to the true point of beginning of this description in Section 14, Township 19 South, Range 1 West of the Willamette Meridian, Lane County, Oregon.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Before conveying the parcel to the school district, the Secretary shall ensure that the conditions of buildings and facilities meet the requirements of applicable Federal law.

(4) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be held in public ownership, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert to the United States, at the option of the United States.

(i) RICHARD B. RUSSELL LAKE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey, at fair market value, to the State of South Carolina, by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcels of land described in paragraph (2)(A) that are managed, as of the date of enactment of this Act, by the South Carolina department of commerce for public recreation purposes for the Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, South Caro-

lina, project authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1420).

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the parcels of land referred to in paragraph (1) are the parcels contained in the portion of land described in Army Lease Number DACW21-1-92-0500.

(B) RETENTION OF INTERESTS.—The United States shall retain—

(i) ownership of all land included in the lease referred to in subparagraph (A) that would have been acquired for operational purposes in accordance with the 1971 implementation of the 1962 Army/Interior Joint Acquisition Policy; and

(ii) such other land as is determined by the Secretary to be required for authorized project purposes, including easement rights-of-way to remaining Federal land.

(C) SURVEY.—The cost of the survey shall be paid by the State.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The State shall be responsible for all costs, including real estate transaction and environmental costs, associated with the conveyance under this subsection.

(B) FORM OF CONTRIBUTION.—As determined appropriate by the Secretary, in lieu of payment of compensation to the United States under subparagraph (A), the State may perform certain environmental or real estate actions associated with the conveyance under this subsection if those actions are performed in close coordination with, to the satisfaction of, and in compliance with the laws of the United States.

(4) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) NO EFFECT ON SHORE MANAGEMENT POLICY.—The Shoreline Management Policy (ER-1130-2-406) of the Corps of Engineers may not be changed or altered for any proposed development of land conveyed under this subsection.

(B) COST SHARING.—In carrying out the conveyance under this subsection, the Secretary and the State shall comply with all obligations of any cost sharing agreement between the Secretary and the State in effect as of the date of the conveyance.

(C) LAND NOT CONVEYED.—The State shall continue to manage the land that is subject to Army Lease Number DACW21-1-92-0500 and that is not conveyed under this subsection in accordance with the terms and conditions of Army Lease Number DACW21-1-92-0500.

(j) DENISON, TEXAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall offer to convey at fair market value to the city of Denison, Texas, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 900 acres of land located in Grayson County, Texas, which is currently subject to an application for lease for public park and recreational purposes made by the city of Denison, dated August 17, 2005.

(2) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and description of the real property referred to in paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey paid for by the city of Denison, Texas, that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(3) CONVEYANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of acceptance by the city of Denison, Texas, of an offer under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall convey the land surveyed under paragraph (2) by quitclaim deed to the city of Denison, Texas.

(k) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance

under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(5) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

### SEC. 3183. EXTINGUISHMENT OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS AND USE RESTRICTIONS.

(a) IDAHO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the property covered by each deed in paragraph (2)—

(A) the reversionary interests and use restrictions relating to port and industrial use purposes are extinguished;

(B) the restriction that no activity shall be permitted that will compete with services and facilities offered by public marinas is extinguished; and

(C) the human habitation or other building structure use restriction is extinguished if the elevation of the property is above the standard project flood elevation.

(2) AFFECTED DEEDS.—The deeds with the following county auditor's file numbers are referred to in paragraph (1):

(A) Auditor's Instrument No. 399218 of Nez Perce County, Idaho—2.07 acres.

(B) Auditor's Instrument No. 487437 of Nez Perce County, Idaho—7.32 acres.

(b) LAKE TEXOMA, OKLAHOMA.—

(1) RELEASE.—Any reversionary interest relating to public parks and recreation on the land conveyed by the Secretary to the State of Oklahoma at Lake Texoma pursuant to the Act entitled “An Act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma” (67 Stat. 63), shall terminate on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, an amended deed, or any other appropriate instrument to release each reversionary interest to which paragraph (1) applies.

(3) PRESERVATION OF RESERVED RIGHTS.—A release of a reversionary interest under this subsection shall not affect any other right of the United States in any deed of conveyance pursuant to the Act referred to in paragraph (1).

(c) LOWELL, OREGON.—

(1) RELEASE AND EXTINGUISHMENT OF DEED RESERVATIONS.—

(A) RELEASE AND EXTINGUISHMENT OF DEED RESERVATIONS.—The Secretary may release and extinguish the deed reservations for access and communication cables contained in the quitclaim deed, dated January 26, 1965, and recorded February 15, 1965, in the records of Lane County, Oregon; except that such reservations may only be released and extinguished for the lands owned by the city of Lowell as described in the quitclaim deed, dated April 11, 1991, in such records.

(B) ADDITIONAL RELEASE AND EXTINGUISHMENT OF DEED RESERVATIONS.—The Secretary may also release and extinguish the same deed reservations referred to in subparagraph (A) over land owned by Lane County, Oregon, within the city limits of Lowell, Oregon, to accommodate the development proposals of the city of Lowell/St. Vincent de Paul, Lane County, affordable housing project; except that the Secretary may require, at no cost to the United States—

(i) the alteration or relocation of any existing facilities, utilities, roads, or similar improvements on such lands; and

(ii) the right-of-way for such facilities, utilities, roads, or improvements as a precondition of any release or extinguishment of the deed reservations.

(2) **CONVEYANCE.**—The Secretary may convey to the city of Lowell, Oregon, the parcel of land situated in the city of Lowell, Oregon, at fair market value consisting of the strip of federally owned lands located northeast of West Boundary Road between Hyland Lane and the city of Lowell's eastward city limits.

(3) **ADMINISTRATIVE COST.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the city of Lowell, Oregon, shall pay the administrative costs incurred by the United States to execute the release and extinguishment of the deed reservations under paragraph (1) and the conveyance under paragraph (2).

(d) **OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, CUMBERLAND RIVER, TENNESSEE.**—

(1) **RELEASE OF RETAINED RIGHTS, INTERESTS, RESERVATIONS.**—With respect to land conveyed by the Secretary to the Tennessee Society of Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated (commonly known as "Easter Seals Tennessee") at Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under section 211 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1087), the reversionary interests and the use restrictions relating to recreation and camping purposes are extinguished.

(2) **INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument effectuating the release of interests required by paragraph (1).

(e) **LOWER GRANITE POOL, WASHINGTON.**—

(1) **EXTINGUISHMENT OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS AND USE RESTRICTIONS.**—With respect to property covered by each deed described in paragraph (2)—

(A) the reversionary interests and use restrictions relating to port or industrial purposes are extinguished; and

(B) the human habitation or other building structure use restriction is extinguished in each area in which the elevation is above the standard project flood elevation.

(2) **DEEDS.**—The deeds referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) Auditor's File Numbers 432576, 443411, 499988, and 579771 of Whitman County, Washington.

(B) Auditor's File Numbers 125806, 138801, 147888, 154511, 156928, and 176360 of Asotin County, Washington.

(f) **PORT OF PASCO, WASHINGTON.**—

(1) **EXTINGUISHMENT OF USE RESTRICTIONS AND FLOWAGE EASEMENT.**—With respect to the property covered by the deed in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) the flowage easement and human habitation or other building structure use restriction is extinguished if the elevation of the property is above the standard project flood elevation; and

(B) the use of fill material to raise areas of the property above the standard project flood elevation is authorized, except in any area for which a permit under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is required.

(2) **EXTINGUISHMENT OF FLOWAGE EASEMENT.**—With respect to the property covered by each deed in paragraph (3)(B), the flowage easement is extinguished if the elevation of the property is above the standard project flood elevation.

(3) **AFFECTED DEEDS.**—The deeds referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) are as follows:

(A) Auditor's File Number 262980 of Franklin County, Washington.

(B) Auditor's File Numbers 263334 and 404398 of Franklin County, Washington.

(g) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this section affects the remaining rights and in-

terests of the Corps of Engineers for authorized project purposes.

#### TITLE IV—STUDIES

##### SEC. 4001. JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM.

Section 455 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–21) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) **IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS FOR STUDY.**—The non-Federal interest may provide up to 100 percent of the non-Federal share required under subsection (f) in the form of in-kind services and materials."

##### SEC. 4002. LAKE ERIE DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITES.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the nature and frequency of avian botulism problems in the vicinity of Lake Erie associated with dredged material disposal sites and shall make recommendations to eliminate the conditions that result in such problems.

##### SEC. 4003. SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES DROUGHT STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and other appropriate agencies, shall conduct, at Federal expense, a comprehensive study of drought conditions in the southwestern United States, with particular emphasis on the Colorado River basin, the Rio Grande River basin, and the Great Basin.

(b) **INVENTORY OF ACTIONS.**—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall assemble an inventory of actions taken or planned to be taken to address drought-related situations in the southwestern United States.

(c) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the study shall be to develop recommendations to more effectively address current and future drought conditions in the southwestern United States.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$7,000,000. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

##### SEC. 4004. DELAWARE RIVER.

The Secretary shall review, in consultation with the Delaware River Basin Commission and the States of Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Delaware River, published as House Document Numbered 522, 87th Congress, Second Session, as it relates to the Mid-Delaware River Basin from Wilmington to Port Jervis, and any other pertinent reports (including the strategy for resolution of interstate flow management issues in the Delaware River Basin dated August 2004 and the National Park Service Lower Delaware River Management Plan (1997–1999)), with a view to determining whether any modifications of recommendations contained in the first report referred to are advisable at the present time, in the interest of flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and other related problems.

##### SEC. 4005. EURASIAN MILFOIL.

Under the authority of section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610), the Secretary shall conduct a study, at Federal expense, to develop national protocols for the use of the *Euhrychiopsis lecontei* weevil for biological control of Eurasian milfoil in the lakes of Vermont and other northeastern States.

##### SEC. 4006. FIRE ISLAND, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, including a barge landing facility, Fire Island, Alaska.

##### SEC. 4007. KNIK ARM, COOK INLET, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the potential impacts on navigation of construction of a bridge across Knik Arm, Cook Inlet, Alaska.

##### SEC. 4008. KUSKOKWIM RIVER, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for

navigation, Kuskokwim River, Alaska, in the vicinity of the village of Crooked Creek.

##### SEC. 4009. NOME HARBOR, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall review the project for navigation, Nome Harbor improvements, Alaska, authorized by section 101(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 273), to determine whether the project cost increases, including the cost of rebuilding the entrance channel damaged in a September 2005 storm, resulted from a design deficiency.

##### SEC. 4010. ST. GEORGE HARBOR, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of providing navigation improvements at St. George Harbor, Alaska.

##### SEC. 4011. SUSITNA RIVER, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hydropower, recreation, and related purposes on the Susitna River, Alaska.

##### SEC. 4012. VALDEZ, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, Valdez, Alaska, and if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, shall carry out the project at a total cost of \$20,000,000.

##### SEC. 4013. GILA BEND, MARICOPA, ARIZONA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Gila Bend, Maricopa, Arizona.

(b) **REVIEW OF PLANS.**—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall review plans and designs developed by non-Federal interests and shall incorporate such plans and designs into the Federal study if the Secretary determines that such plans and designs are consistent with Federal standards.

##### SEC. 4014. SEARCY COUNTY, ARKANSAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of using Greers Ferry Lake as a water supply source for Searcy County, Arkansas.

##### SEC. 4015. ALISO CREEK, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for streambank protection and environmental restoration along Aliso Creek, California.

##### SEC. 4016. FRESNO, KINGS, AND KERN COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply for Fresno, Kings, and Kern Counties, California.

##### SEC. 4017. FRUITVALE AVENUE RAILROAD BRIDGE, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prepare a comprehensive report that examines the condition of the existing Fruitvale Avenue Railroad Bridge, Alameda County, California (referred to in this section as the "Railroad Bridge"), and determines the most economic means to maintain that rail link by either repairing or replacing the Railroad Bridge.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The report under this section shall include—

(1) a determination of whether the Railroad Bridge is in immediate danger of failing or collapsing;

(2) the annual costs to maintain the Railroad Bridge;

(3) the costs to place the Railroad Bridge in a safe, "no-collapse" condition, such that the Railroad Bridge will not endanger maritime traffic;

(4) the costs to retrofit the Railroad Bridge such that the Railroad Bridge may continue to serve as a rail link between the Island of Alameda and the mainland; and

(5) the costs to construct a replacement for the Railroad Bridge capable of serving the current and future rail, light rail, and homeland security needs of the region.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF REPORT.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) complete the Railroad Bridge report under subsection (a) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) submit the report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary shall not—  
(1) demolish the Railroad Bridge or otherwise render the Railroad Bridge unavailable or unusable for rail traffic; or

(2) reduce maintenance of the Railroad Bridge.

(e) EASEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to the city of Alameda, California, a nonexclusive access easement over the Oakland Estuary that comprises the subsurface land and surface approaches for the Railroad Bridge that—

(A) is consistent with the Bay Trail Proposal of the city of Oakland; and

(B) is otherwise suitable for the improvement, operation, and maintenance of the Railroad Bridge or construction, operation, and maintenance of a suitable replacement bridge.

(2) COST.—The easement under paragraph (1) shall be provided to the city of Alameda without consideration and at no cost to the United States.

#### SEC. 4018. LOS ANGELES RIVER REVITALIZATION STUDY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the city of Los Angeles, shall—

(1) prepare a feasibility study for environmental ecosystem restoration, flood control, recreation, and other aspects of Los Angeles River revitalization that is consistent with the goals of the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan published by the city of Los Angeles; and

(2) consider any locally-preferred project alternatives developed through a full and open evaluation process for inclusion in the study.

(b) USE OF EXISTING INFORMATION AND MEASURES.—In preparing the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) information obtained from the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan; and

(2) the development process of that plan.

(c) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to construct demonstration projects in order to provide information to develop the study under subsection (a)(1).

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any project under this subsection shall be not more than 65 percent.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$25,000,000.

#### SEC. 4019. LYTLE CREEK, RIALTO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and groundwater recharge, Lytle Creek, Rialto, California.

#### SEC. 4020. MOKELUMNE RIVER, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply along the Mokelumne River, San Joaquin County, California.

(b) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to invalidate, preempt, or create any exception to State water law, State water rights, or Federal or State permitted activities or agreements.

#### SEC. 4021. ORICK, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Orick, California.

(b) FEASIBILITY OF RESTORING OR REHABILITATING REDWOOD CREEK LEVEES.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall determine

the feasibility of restoring or rehabilitating the Redwood Creek Levees, Humboldt County, California.

#### SEC. 4022. SHORELINE STUDY, OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA.

Section 414 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2636) is amended by striking “32 months” and inserting “44 months”.

#### SEC. 4023. RIALTO, FONTANA, AND COLTON, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply for Rialto, Fontana, and Colton, California.

#### SEC. 4024. SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study to determine the feasibility of, and alternatives for, measures to protect water diversion facilities and fish protective screen facilities in the vicinity of river mile 178 on the Sacramento River, California.

#### SEC. 4025. SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, San Diego County, California, including a review of the feasibility of connecting 4 existing reservoirs to increase usable storage capacity.

#### SEC. 4026. SAN FRANCISCO BAY, SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of the beneficial use of dredged material from the San Francisco Bay in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, including the benefits and impacts of salinity in the Delta and the benefits to navigation, flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, water quality, salinity control, water supply reliability, and recreation.

(b) COOPERATION.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall cooperate with the California department of water resources and appropriate Federal and State entities in developing options for the beneficial use of dredged material from San Francisco Bay for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta area.

(c) REVIEW.—The study shall include a review of the feasibility of using Sherman Island as a rehandling site for levee maintenance material, as well as for ecosystem restoration. The review may include carrying out and monitoring a pilot project using up to 150,000 cubic yards of dredged material and being carried out at the Sherman Island site, examining larger scale use of dredged materials from the San Francisco Bay and Suisun Bay Channel, and analyzing the feasibility of the potential use of saline materials from the San Francisco Bay for both rehandling and ecosystem restoration purposes.

#### SEC. 4027. SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with non-Federal interests, shall conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out a project for—

(1) flood damage reduction along the South San Francisco Bay shoreline, California;

(2) restoration of the South San Francisco Bay salt ponds (including on land owned by other Federal agencies); and

(3) other related purposes, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the results of the study under subsection (a).

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project described in subsection (a) based on planning, design, and land acquisition documents prepared by—

(A) the California State Coastal Conservancy;

(B) the Santa Clara Valley Water District; and

(C) other local interests.

(c) CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), and subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of any project authorized by law as a result of the South San Francisco Bay shoreline study—

(A) the cost of work performed by the non-Federal interest in preparation of the feasibility study that is conducted before the date of the feasibility cost sharing agreement; and

(B) the funds expended by the non-Federal interest for acquisition costs of land that constitutes a part of such a project and that is owned by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(2) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may provide credit under paragraph (1) if—

(A) the value of all or any portion of land referred to in paragraph (1)(B) that would be subject to the credit has not previously been credited to the non-Federal interest for a project; and

(B) the land was not acquired to meet any mitigation requirement of the non-Federal interest.

#### SEC. 4028. TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction in the vicinity of Twentynine Palms, California.

#### SEC. 4029. YUCCA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Burnt Mountain basin, in the vicinity of Yucca Valley, California.

#### SEC. 4030. SELENIUM STUDIES, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the United States Geological Survey, in consultation with State water quality and resource and conservation agencies, shall conduct regional and watershed-wide studies to address selenium concentrations in the State of Colorado, including studies—

(1) to measure selenium on specific sites; and

(2) to determine whether specific selenium measures studied should be recommended for use in demonstration projects.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000.

#### SEC. 4031. DELAWARE AND CHRISTINA RIVERS AND SHELLPOT CREEK, WILMINGTON, DELAWARE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and related purposes along the Delaware and Christina Rivers and Shellpot Creek, Wilmington, Delaware.

#### SEC. 4032. DELAWARE INLAND BAYS AND TRIBUTARIES AND ATLANTIC COAST, DELAWARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for navigation, Indian River Inlet and Bay, Delaware.

(b) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION AND PRIORITY.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) take into consideration all necessary activities to stabilize the scour holes threatening the Inlet and Bay shorelines; and

(2) give priority to stabilizing and restoring the Inlet channel and scour holes adjacent to the United States Coast Guard pier and helipad and the adjacent State-owned properties.

#### SEC. 4033. COLLIER COUNTY BEACHES, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and flood damage reduction in the vicinity of Vanderbilt, Park Shore, and Naples beaches, Collier County, Florida.

#### SEC. 4034. LOWER ST. JOHNS RIVER, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for

environmental restoration, including improved water quality, and related purposes, Lower St. Johns River, Florida.

**SEC. 4035. HERBERT HOOVER DIKE SUPPLEMENTAL MAJOR REHABILITATION REPORT, FLORIDA.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a supplemental report to the major rehabilitation report for the Herbert Hoover Dike system approved by the Chief of Engineers in November 2000.

(b) *INCLUSIONS.*—The supplemental report under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an evaluation of existing conditions at the Herbert Hoover Dike system;

(2) an identification of additional risks associated with flood events at the system that are equal to or greater than the standard projected flood risks;

(3) an evaluation of the potential to integrate projects of the Corps of Engineers into an enhanced flood protection system for Lake Okeechobee, including—

(A) the potential for additional water storage north of Lake Okeechobee; and

(B) an analysis of other project features included in the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan; and

(4) a review of the report prepared for the South Florida Water Management District dated April 2006.

(c) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,500,000.

**SEC. 4036. VANDERBILT BEACH LAGOON, FLORIDA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, water supply, and improvement of water quality at Vanderbilt Beach Lagoon, Florida.

**SEC. 4037. MERIWETHER COUNTY, GEORGIA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Meriwether County, Georgia.

**SEC. 4038. BOISE RIVER, IDAHO.**

The study for flood control, Boise River, Idaho, authorized by section 414 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 324), is modified—

(1) to add ecosystem restoration and water supply as project purposes to be studied; and

(2) to require the Secretary to credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the study the cost, not to exceed \$500,000, of work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

**SEC. 4039. BALLARD'S ISLAND SIDE CHANNEL, ILLINOIS.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for ecosystem restoration, Ballard's Island side channel, Illinois.

**SEC. 4040. CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.**

Section 425(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2638) is amended by inserting "Lake Michigan and" before "the Chicago River".

**SEC. 4041. SALEM, INDIANA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project to provide an additional water supply source for Salem, Indiana.

**SEC. 4042. BUCKHORN LAKE, KENTUCKY.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for flood damage reduction, Buckhorn Lake, Kentucky, authorized by section 2 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1217), to add ecosystem restoration and recreation as project purposes.

(b) *IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.*—The non-Federal interest may provide the non-Federal share

of the cost of the study in the form of in-kind services and materials.

**SEC. 4043. DEWEY LAKE, KENTUCKY.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for Dewey Lake, Kentucky, to add water supply as a project purpose.

**SEC. 4044. LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the project for flood control, Louisville, Kentucky, authorized by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1217), to investigate measures to address the rehabilitation of the project.

**SEC. 4045. VIDALIA PORT, LOUISIANA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation improvement at Vidalia, Louisiana.

**SEC. 4046. FALL RIVER HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS AND RHODE ISLAND.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of deepening that portion of the navigation channel of the navigation project for Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731), seaward of the Charles M. Braga, Jr. Memorial Bridge, Fall River and Somerset, Massachusetts.

**SEC. 4047. CLINTON RIVER, MICHIGAN.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, Clinton River, Michigan.

**SEC. 4048. HAMBURG AND GREEN OAK TOWNSHIPS, MICHIGAN.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction on Ore Lake and the Huron River for Hamburg and Green Oak Townships, Michigan.

**SEC. 4049. LAKE ERIE AT LUNA PIER, MICHIGAN.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and other related purposes along Lake Erie at Luna Pier, Michigan.

**SEC. 4050. DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MINNESOTA AND WISCONSIN.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall conduct a study and prepare a report to evaluate the integrity of the bulkhead system located on and in the vicinity of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Duluth, Minnesota, and Superior, Wisconsin.

(b) *CONTENTS.*—The report shall include—

(1) a determination of causes of corrosion of the bulkhead system;

(2) recommendations to reduce corrosion of the bulkhead system;

(3) a description of the necessary repairs to the bulkhead system; and

(4) an estimate of the cost of addressing the causes of the corrosion and carrying out necessary repairs.

**SEC. 4051. NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for navigation, Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi, to provide water supply for northeast Mississippi.

**SEC. 4052. DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL, NEW JERSEY.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project in the vicinity of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, New Jersey, for the construction of a dredged material disposal transfer facility to make dredged material available for beneficial reuse.

**SEC. 4053. BAYONNE, NEW JERSEY.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, including improved water quality, enhanced public access, and recreation, on the Kill Van Kull, Bayonne, New Jersey.

**SEC. 4054. CARTERET, NEW JERSEY.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for

environmental restoration, including improved water quality, enhanced public access, and recreation, on the Raritan River, Carteret, New Jersey.

**SEC. 4055. GLOUCESTER COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Gloucester County, New Jersey, including the feasibility of restoring the flood protection dikes in Gibbstown, New Jersey, and the associated tidegates in Gloucester County, New Jersey.

**SEC. 4056. PERTH AMBOY, NEW JERSEY.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and recreation on the Arthur Kill, Perth Amboy, New Jersey.

**SEC. 4057. BATAVIA, NEW YORK.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hydropower and related purposes in the vicinity of Batavia, New York.

**SEC. 4058. BIG SISTER CREEK, EVANS, NEW YORK.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Big Sister Creek, Evans, New York.

(b) *EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS.*—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall evaluate potential solutions to flooding from all sources, including flooding that results from ice jams.

**SEC. 4059. FINGER LAKES, NEW YORK.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection, Finger Lakes, New York, to address water quality and aquatic nuisance species.

**SEC. 4060. LAKE ERIE SHORELINE, BUFFALO, NEW YORK.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection in the vicinity of Gallagher Beach, Lake Erie Shoreline, Buffalo, New York.

**SEC. 4061. NEWTOWN CREEK, NEW YORK.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out ecosystem restoration improvements on Newtown Creek, Brooklyn and Queens, New York.

**SEC. 4062. NIAGARA RIVER, NEW YORK.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for a low-head hydroelectric generating facility in the Niagara River, New York.

**SEC. 4063. SHORE PARKWAY GREENWAY, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection in the vicinity of the confluence of the Narrows and Gravesend Bay, Upper New York Bay, Shore Parkway Greenway, Brooklyn, New York.

**SEC. 4064. UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NEW YORK.**

In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), a non-profit organization may serve, with the consent of the affected local government, as the non-Federal interest for a study for the Upper Delaware River watershed, New York, being carried out under Committee Resolution 2495 of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, adopted May 9, 1996.

**SEC. 4065. LINCOLN COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of existing water and water quality-related infrastructure in Lincoln County, North Carolina, to assist local interests in determining the most efficient and effective way to connect county infrastructure.

**SEC. 4066. WILKES COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Wilkes County, North Carolina.

**SEC. 4067. YADKINVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Yadkinville, North Carolina.

**SEC. 4068. FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, OHIO.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction in Cuyahoga, Lake, Ashtabula, Geauga, Erie, Lucas, Sandusky, Huron, and Stark Counties, Ohio.

**SEC. 4069. LAKE ERIE, OHIO.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for power generation at confined disposal facilities along Lake Erie, Ohio.

**SEC. 4070. OHIO RIVER, OHIO.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction on the Ohio River in Mahoning, Columbiana, Jefferson, Belmont, Noble, Monroe, Washington, Athens, Meigs, Gallia, Lawrence, and Scioto Counties, Ohio.

**SEC. 4071. TOLEDO HARBOR DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT, TOLEDO, OHIO.**

The Secretary shall study the feasibility of removing previously dredged and placed materials from the Toledo Harbor confined disposal facility, transporting the materials, and disposing of the materials in or at abandoned mine sites in southeastern Ohio.

**SEC. 4072. TOLEDO HARBOR, MAUMEE RIVER, AND LAKE CHANNEL PROJECT, TOLEDO, OHIO.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a project for navigation, Toledo, Ohio.

(b) *FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.*—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(1) realigning the existing Toledo Harbor channel widening occurring where the River Channel meets the Lake Channel from the northwest to the southeast side of the River Channel;

(2) realigning the entire 200-foot wide channel located at the upper river terminus of the River Channel southern river embankment towards the northern river embankment; and

(3) adjusting the existing turning basin to accommodate those changes.

**SEC. 4073. ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FISH PASSAGE IMPROVEMENTS, OREGON.**

(a) *STUDY.*—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking ecosystem restoration and fish passage improvements on rivers throughout the State of Oregon.

(b) *REQUIREMENTS.*—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) work in coordination with the State of Oregon, local governments, and other Federal agencies; and

(2) place emphasis on—

(A) fish passage and conservation and restoration strategies to benefit species that are listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(B) other watershed restoration objectives.

(c) *PILOT PROGRAM.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In conjunction with conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary may carry out pilot projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of ecosystem restoration and fish passages.

(2) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out this subsection.

**SEC. 4074. WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN, OREGON.**

In conducting the study of determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for ecosystem restoration, Walla Walla River basin, Oregon, the Secretary shall—

(1) credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the study the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project if the Sec-

retary determines that the work is integral to the project; and

(2) allow the non-Federal interest to provide the non-Federal share of the cost of the study in the form of in-kind services and materials.

**SEC. 4075. CHARTIERS CREEK WATERSHED, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Chartiers Creek watershed, Pennsylvania.

**SEC. 4076. KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the project for flood control, Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Warren, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), and modified by section 2 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 646), and section 4 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), to review operations of and identify modifications to the project to expand recreational opportunities.

**SEC. 4077. WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall conduct a study of structural and nonstructural flood damage reduction, stream bank protection, storm water management, channel clearing and modification, and watershed coordination measures in the Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania, the Allegheny River basin, Pennsylvania, and the Upper Ohio River basin, Pennsylvania, to provide a level of flood protection sufficient to prevent future losses to communities located in such basins from flooding such as occurred in September 2004, but not less than a 100-year level of flood protection.

(b) *PRIORITY COMMUNITIES.*—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the following Pennsylvania communities: Marshall Township, Ross Township, Shaler Township, Jackson Township, Harmony, Zelienople, Darlington Township, Houston Borough, Chartiers Township, Washington, Canton Township, Tarentum Borough, and East Deer Township.

**SEC. 4078. WILLIAMSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the project for flood control, Williamsport, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), to investigate measures to rehabilitate the project.

**SEC. 4079. YARDLEY BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, at Yardley Borough, Pennsylvania, including the alternative of raising River Road.

**SEC. 4080. RIO VALENCIANO, JUNCOS, PUERTO RICO.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall conduct a study to reevaluate the project for flood damage reduction and water supply, Rio Valenciano, Juncos, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1197) and section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1828), to determine the feasibility of carrying out the project.

(b) *CREDIT.*—The Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the study the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

**SEC. 4081. WOONSOCKET LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, BLACKSTONE RIVER BASIN, RHODE ISLAND.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study, and, not later than June 30, 2008, submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study, on the flood damage reduction project, Woonsocket, Blackstone River basin, Rhode Island, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of

December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 892), to determine the measures necessary to restore the level of protection of the project as originally designed and constructed.

**SEC. 4082. CROOKED CREEK, BENNETTSVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Crooked Creek, Bennettsville, South Carolina.

**SEC. 4083. BROAD RIVER, YORK COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Broad River, York County, South Carolina.

**SEC. 4084. SAVANNAH RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall determine the feasibility of carrying out projects—

(1) to improve the Savannah River for navigation and related purposes that may be necessary to support the location of container cargo and other port facilities to be located in Jasper County, South Carolina, in the vicinity of Mile 6 of the Savannah Harbor entrance channel; and

(2) to remove from the proposed Jasper County port site the easements used by the Corps of Engineers for placement of dredged fill materials for the Savannah Harbor Federal navigation project.

(b) *FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.*—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(1) landside infrastructure;

(2) the provision of any additional dredged material disposal area as a consequence of removing from the proposed Jasper County port site the easements used by the Corps of Engineers for placement of dredged fill materials for the Savannah Harbor Federal navigation project; and

(3) the results of the proposed bistate compact between the State of Georgia and the State of South Carolina to own, develop, and operate port facilities at the proposed Jasper County port site, as described in the term sheet executed by the Governor of the State of Georgia and the Governor of the State of South Carolina on March 12, 2007.

**SEC. 4085. CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Chattanooga Creek, Dobbs Branch, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

**SEC. 4086. CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Cleveland, Tennessee.

**SEC. 4087. CUMBERLAND RIVER, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for recreation on, riverbank protection for, and environmental protection of, the Cumberland River and riparian habitats in the city of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee.

**SEC. 4088. LEWIS, LAWRENCE, AND WAYNE COUNTIES, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply for Lewis, Lawrence, and Wayne Counties, Tennessee.

**SEC. 4089. WOLF RIVER AND NONCONNAH CREEK, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along Wolf River and Nonconna Creek, in the vicinity of Memphis, Tennessee, to include the repair, replacement, rehabilitation, and restoration of the following pumping stations: Cypress Creek, Nonconna Creek, Ensley, Marble Bayou, and Bayou Gayoso.

**SEC. 4090. ABILENE, TEXAS.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Abilene, Texas.

**SEC. 4091. COASTAL TEXAS ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND RESTORATION, TEXAS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop a comprehensive plan to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, hurricane and storm damage reduction, and ecosystem restoration in the coastal areas of the State of Texas.

(b) SCOPE.—The comprehensive plan shall provide for the protection, conservation, and restoration of wetlands, barrier islands, shorelines, and related lands and features that protect critical resources, habitat, and infrastructure from the impacts of coastal storms, hurricanes, erosion, and subsidence.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “coastal areas in the State of Texas” means the coastal areas of the State of Texas from the Sabine River on the east to the Rio Grande River on the west and includes tidal waters, barrier islands, marshes, coastal wetlands, rivers and streams, and adjacent areas.

**SEC. 4092. PORT OF GALVESTON, TEXAS.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out a project for dredged material disposal in the vicinity of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666).

**SEC. 4093. GRAND COUNTY AND MOAB, UTAH.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply for Grand County and the city of Moab, Utah, including a review of the impact of current and future demands on the Spanish Valley Aquifer.

**SEC. 4094. SOUTHWESTERN UTAH.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Santa Clara River, Washington, Iron, and Kane Counties, Utah.

**SEC. 4095. ECOSYSTEM AND HYDROPOWER GENERATION DAMS, VERMONT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the potential to carry out ecosystem restoration and hydropower generation at dams in the State of Vermont, including a review of the report of the Secretary on the land and water resources of the New England–New York region submitted to the President on April 27, 1956 (published as Senate Document Number 14, 85th Congress), and other relevant reports.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the study under subsection (a) shall be to determine the feasibility of providing water resource improvements and small-scale hydropower generation in the State of Vermont, including, as appropriate, options for dam restoration, hydropower, dam removal, and fish passage enhancement.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to carry out this section \$500,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

**SEC. 4096. ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The study for rehabilitation of the Elliott Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington, being carried out under Committee Resolution 2704 of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted September 25, 2002, is modified to include a determination of the feasibility of reducing future damage to the seawall from seismic activity.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary may accept contributions in excess of the non-Federal share of the cost of the study from the non-Federal interest to the extent that the Secretary determines that the contributions will facilitate completion of the study.

(c) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of any project authorized by law as a result of the study the value of contributions accepted by the Secretary under subsection (b).

**SEC. 4097. MONONGAHELA RIVER BASIN, NORTH-EAST WEST VIRGINIA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection projects in the watersheds of the Monongahela River Basin lying within the counties of Hancock, Ohio, Marshall, Wetzel, Tyler, Pleasants, Wood, Doddridge, Monongalia, Marion, Harrison, Taylor, Barbour, Preston, Tucker, Mineral, Grant, Gilmer, Brooke, and Ritchie, West Virginia.

**SEC. 4098. KENOSHA HARBOR, WISCONSIN.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, Kenosha Harbor, Wisconsin, including the extension of existing piers.

**SEC. 4099. JOHNSONVILLE DAM, JOHNSONVILLE, WISCONSIN.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the Johnsonville Dam, Johnsonville, Wisconsin, to determine if the structure prevents ice jams on the Sheboygan River.

**SEC. 4100. WAUWATOSA, WISCONSIN.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Menomonee River and Underwood Creek, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin, and greater Milwaukee watersheds, Wisconsin.

**SEC. 4101. DEBRIS REMOVAL.**

(a) EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States, in coordination with the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and in consultation with affected communities, shall conduct a complete evaluation of Federal and non-Federal demolition, debris removal, segregation, transportation, and disposal practices relating to disaster areas designated in response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita (including regulated and nonregulated materials and debris).

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The evaluation under paragraph (1) shall include a review of—

(A) compliance with all applicable environmental laws;

(B) permits issued or required to be issued with respect to debris handling, transportation, storage, or disposal; and

(C) administrative actions relating to debris removal and disposal in the disaster areas described in paragraph (1).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General, in consultation with the Secretary and the Administrator, shall submit to the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes the findings of the Comptroller General with respect to the evaluation under subsection (a);

(2)(A) certifies compliance with all applicable environmental laws; and

(B) identifies any area in which a violation of such a law has occurred or is occurring;

(3) includes recommendations to ensure—

(A) the protection of the environment;

(B) sustainable practices; and

(C) the integrity of hurricane and flood protection infrastructure relating to debris disposal practices;

(4) contains an enforcement plan that is designed to prevent illegal dumping of hurricane debris in a disaster area; and

(5) contains plans of the Secretary and the Administrator to involve the public and non-Federal interests, including through the formation of a Federal advisory committee, as necessary, to seek public comment relating to the

removal, disposal, and planning for the handling of post-hurricane debris.

(c) RESTRICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No Federal funds may be used to pay for or reimburse any State or local entity in Louisiana for the disposal of construction and demolition debris generated as a result of Hurricane Katrina in 2005 in a landfill designated for construction and demolition debris as described in section 257.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, unless that waste meets the definition of construction and demolition debris, as specified under Federal law and described in that section on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The restriction in paragraph (1) shall apply only to any disposal that occurs after the date of enactment of this Act.

**TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS****SEC. 5001. MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION CHANNELS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall be responsible for maintenance of the following navigation channels and breakwaters constructed or improved by the non-Federal interest if the Secretary determines that such maintenance is economically justified and environmentally acceptable and that the channel or breakwater was constructed in accordance with applicable permits and appropriate engineering and design standards:

(1) Manatee Harbor basin, Florida.

(2) Tampa Harbor, Sparkman Channel and Davis Island, Florida.

(3) West turning basin, Canaveral Harbor, Florida.

(4) Bayou LaFourche Channel, Port Fourchon, Louisiana.

(5) Calcasieu River at Devil's Elbow, Louisiana.

(6) Pidgeon Industrial Harbor, Pidgeon Industrial Park, Memphis Harbor, Tennessee.

(7) Houston Ship Channel, Bayport Cruise Channel and Bayport Cruise turning basin, as part of the existing Bayport Channel, Texas.

(8) Pir Bayou Navigation Channel, Chambers County, Texas.

(9) Jacintoport Channel at Houston Ship Channel, Texas.

(10) Racine Harbor, Wisconsin.

(b) COMPLETION OF ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of receipt of a request from a non-Federal interest for Federal assumption of maintenance of a channel listed in subsection (a), the Secretary shall make a determination as provided in subsection (a) and advise the non-Federal interest of the Secretary's determination.

**SEC. 5002. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide technical, planning, and design assistance to non-Federal interests for carrying out watershed management, restoration, and development projects at the locations described in subsection (d).

(b) SPECIFIC MEASURES.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) may be in support of non-Federal projects for the following purposes:

(1) Management and restoration of water quality.

(2) Control and remediation of toxic sediments.

(3) Restoration of degraded streams, rivers, wetlands, and other water bodies to their natural condition as a means to control flooding, excessive erosion, and sedimentation.

(4) Protection and restoration of watersheds, including urban watersheds.

(5) Demonstration of technologies for non-structural measures to reduce destructive impacts of flooding.

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be 25 percent.

(d) PROJECT LOCATIONS.—The locations referred to in subsection (a) are the following:



(1) Charlotte Harbor watershed, Florida.  
 (2) Those portions of the watersheds of the Chattahoochee, Etowah, Flint, Ocmulgee, and Oconee Rivers lying within the counties of Bartow, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Fulton, Forsyth, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Paulding, Rockdale, and Walton, Georgia.

(3) Kinkaid Lake, Jackson County, Illinois.  
 (4) Amite River basin, Louisiana.  
 (5) East Atchafalaya River basin, Iberville Parish and Pointe Coupee Parish, Louisiana.  
 (6) Red River watershed, Louisiana.  
 (7) Taunton River basin, Massachusetts.  
 (8) Marlboro Township, New Jersey.  
 (9) Esopus, Plattekill, and Rondout Creeks, Greene, Sullivan, and Ulster Counties, New York.  
 (10) Greenwood Lake watershed, New York and New Jersey.

(11) Long Island Sound watershed, New York.  
 (12) Ramapo River watershed, New York.  
 (13) Tuscarawas River basin, Ohio.  
 (14) Western Lake Erie basin, Ohio.  
 (15) Those portions of the watersheds of the Beaver, Upper Ohio, Connoquenessing, Lower Allegheny, Kiskiminetas, Lower Monongahela, Youghiogheny, Shenango, and Mahoning Rivers lying within the counties of Beaver, Butler, Lawrence, and Mercer, Pennsylvania.

(16) Otter Creek watershed, Pennsylvania.  
 (17) Nami Creek watershed, Milford Township, Pennsylvania.

(18) Sauk River basin, Washington.  
 (e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$15,000,000.

#### **SEC. 5003. DAM SAFETY.**

(a) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary may provide assistance to enhance dam safety at the following locations:

(1) Fish Creek Dam, Blaine County, Idaho.  
 (2) Keith Creek, Rockford, Illinois.  
 (3) Mount Zion Mill Pond Dam, Fulton County, Indiana.  
 (4) Hamilton Dam, Flint River, Flint, Michigan.

(5) Congers Lake Dam, Rockland County, New York.

(6) Lake Lucille Dam, New City, New York.  
 (7) Peconic River Dams, town of Riverhead, Suffolk, Long Island, New York.

(8) Pine Grove Lakes Dam, Sloatsburg, New York.

(9) State Dam, Auburn, New York.

(10) Whaley Lake Dam, Pawling, New York.

(11) Brightwood Dam, Concord Township, Ohio.

(12) Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania.

(13) Leaser Lake Dam, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania.

(14) Stillwater Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania.

(15) Wissahickon Creek Dam, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—The assistance provided under subsection (a) for State Dam, Auburn, New York, shall be for a project for rehabilitation in accordance with the report on State Dam Rehabilitation, Owasco Lake Outlet, New York, dated March 1999, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (a) \$12,000,000.

#### **SEC. 5004. STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY EVALUATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall evaluate the structural integrity and effectiveness of a project for flood damage reduction and, if the Secretary determines that the project does not meet such minimum standards as the Secretary may establish and absent action by the Secretary the project will fail, the Secretary may take such action as may be necessary to restore the integrity and effectiveness of the project.

(b) **PRIORITY.**—The Secretary shall carry out an evaluation and take such actions as may be necessary under subsection (a) for the project for flood damage reduction, Arkansas River Levees, Arkansas.

#### **SEC. 5005. FLOOD MITIGATION PRIORITY AREAS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 212(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332(e); 114 Stat. 2599) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraphs (23) and (27);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (28) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) Ascension Parish, Louisiana;  
 “(30) East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana;  
 “(31) Iberville Parish, Louisiana;  
 “(32) Livingston Parish, Louisiana; and  
 “(33) Pointe Coupee Parish, Louisiana.”

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 212(i)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2332(i)(1)) is amended by striking “section—” and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting “section \$20,000,000”.

#### **SEC. 5006. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 219(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (7);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) \$35,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(18);

“(10) \$27,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(19);

“(11) \$20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(20);

“(12) \$35,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(23);

“(13) \$20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(25);

“(14) \$20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(26);

“(15) \$35,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(27);

“(16) \$20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(28); and

“(17) \$30,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(40).”

(b) **EAST ARKANSAS ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY, ARKANSAS.**—Federal assistance made available under the rural enterprise zone program of the Department of Agriculture may be used toward payment of the non-Federal share of the costs of the project described in section 219(c)(20) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (114 Stat. 2763A–219) if such assistance is authorized to be used for such purposes.

#### **SEC. 5007. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF REPORTS AND CONSTRUCTION FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.**

The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reports and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, shall expedite completion of construction for the following projects:

(1) Project for navigation, Whittier, Alaska.

(2) Laguna Creek watershed flood damage reduction project, California.

(3) Daytona Beach shore protection project, Florida.

(4) Flagler Beach shore protection project, Florida.

(5) St. Johns County shore protection project, Florida.

(6) Chenier Plain environmental restoration project, Louisiana.

(7) False River, Louisiana, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

(8) North River, Peabody, Massachusetts, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(9) Fulmer Creek, Village of Mohawk, New York, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(10) Moyer Creek, Village of Frankfort, New York, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(11) Steele Creek, Village of Ilion, New York, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(12) Oriskany Wildlife Management Area, Rome, New York, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

(13) Whitney Point Lake, Otselec River, Whitney Point, New York, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a).

(14) Chenango Lake, Chenango County, New York, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

#### **SEC. 5008. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF REPORTS FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reports for the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is justified in the completed report, proceed directly to project preconstruction, engineering, and design:

(1) Project for water supply, Little Red River, Arkansas.

(2) Watershed study, Fountain Creek, north of Pueblo, Colorado.

(3) Project for shoreline stabilization at Egmont Key, Florida.

(4) Project for navigation, Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas and Louisiana.

(5) Project for ecosystem restoration, University Lake, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE FOR EGDMONT KEY, FLORIDA.**—In carrying out the project for shoreline stabilization at Egmont Key, Florida, referred to in subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall waive any cost share to be provided by non-Federal interests for any portion of the project that benefits federally owned property.

#### **SEC. 5009. SOUTHEASTERN WATER RESOURCES ASSESSMENT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct, at Federal expense, an assessment of the water resources needs of the river basins and watersheds of the southeastern United States.

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—In carrying out the assessment, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with State and local agencies, non-Federal and nonprofit entities, and regional researchers.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$7,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### **SEC. 5010. MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.**

Section 514 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 343; 117 Stat. 142) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A) by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary shall ensure that such activities are carried out throughout the geographic area that is subject to the plan.”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project or activity carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.”;

(4) in subsection (g) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The non-Federal share of the costs of activities carried out under the plan may be provided—

“(i) in cash;

“(ii) by the provision of land, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, or disposal areas;

“(iii) by in-kind services to implement the project; or

“(iv) by any combination thereof.

“(B) PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.—Land needed for activities carried out under the plan and credited toward the non-Federal share of the cost of an activity may remain in private ownership subject to easements that are—

“(i) satisfactory to the Secretary; and

“(ii) necessary to ensure achievement of the project purposes.”; and

(5) in subsection (h) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section) by striking “for the period of fiscal years 2003 and 2004.” and inserting “per fiscal year through fiscal year 2015.”

#### SEC. 5011. GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—Section 506(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–22(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) RECONNAISSANCE STUDIES.—Before planning, designing, or constructing a project under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall carry out a reconnaissance study—

“(A) to identify methods of restoring the fishery, ecosystem, and beneficial uses of the Great Lakes; and

“(B) to determine whether planning of a project under paragraph (3) should proceed.”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(A) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(b) COST SHARING.—Section 506(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–22(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “The Federal share” and inserting “Except for reconnaissance studies, the Federal share”; and

(B) by striking “(2) or (3)” and inserting “(3) or (4)”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “subsection (c)(2)” and inserting “subsection (c)(3)”;

and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “50 percent” and inserting “100 percent”; and

(3) in paragraph (5) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting “In accordance with”.

#### SEC. 5012. GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS AND SEDIMENT REMEDIATION.

Section 401(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1268 note; 104 Stat. 4644; 114 Stat. 2613) is amended by striking “through 2006” and inserting “through 2012”.

#### SEC. 5013. GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODELS.

Section 516(g)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2326b(g)(2)) is amended by striking “through 2006” and inserting “through 2012”.

#### SEC. 5014. GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION AND PROTECTION.

(a) GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION.—Using available funds, the Secretary shall expedite the operation and maintenance, including dredging, of the navigation features of the Great Lakes and Connecting Channels for the purpose of supporting commercial navigation to authorized project depths.

(b) GREAT LAKES PILOT PROJECT.—Using available funds, the Director of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, in coordination with the Secretary, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall carry out a pilot project, on an emergency basis, to control and prevent further spreading of viral hemorrhagic septicemia in the Great Lakes and Connecting Channels.

(c) GREAT LAKES AND CONNECTING CHANNELS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Great Lakes and Connecting Channels” includes Lakes Superior, Huron, Michigan, Erie, and Ontario, all connecting waters between and among such lakes used for commercial navigation, any navigation features in such lakes or waters that are a Federal operation or maintenance responsibility, and areas of the Saint Lawrence River that are operated or maintained by the Federal Government for commercial navigation.

#### SEC. 5015. SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized, using amounts contributed by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation under subsection (b), to carry out projects for operations, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation, including associated maintenance dredging, of the Eisenhower and Snell lock facilities and related navigational infrastructure for the Saint Lawrence Seaway, at a total cost of \$134,650,000.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary is authorized to accept funds from the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to carry out projects under this section. Such funds may include amounts made available to the Corporation from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and the general fund of the Treasury of the United States pursuant to section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238).

(c) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section authorizes the construction of any project to increase the depth or width of the navigation channel to a level greater than that previously authorized and existing on the date of enactment of this Act or to increase the dimensions of the Eisenhower and Snell lock facilities.

#### SEC. 5016. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER DISPERSAL BARRIER PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, shall study, design, and carry out a project to delay, deter, impede, or restrict the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species into the northern reaches of the Upper Mississippi River system. The Secretary shall complete the study, design, and construction of the project not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) DISPERSAL BARRIER.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary, at Federal expense, shall—

(1) investigate and identify environmentally sound methods for preventing and reducing the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species through the northern reaches of the Upper Mississippi River system;

(2) use available technologies and measures;

(3) monitor and evaluate, in cooperation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the effectiveness of the project in preventing and reducing the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species through the northern reaches of the Upper Mississippi River system;

(4) submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the evaluation conducted under paragraph (3); and

(5) operate and maintain the project.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into consideration the feasibility of locating the dispersal barrier at the lock portion of the project at Lock and Dam 11 in the Upper Mississippi River basin.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 5017. ESTUARY RESTORATION.

(a) PURPOSES.—Section 102 of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2901) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “by implementing a coordinated Federal approach to estuary habitat restoration activities, including the use of common monitoring standards and a common system for tracking restoration acreage”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting “and implement” after “to develop”; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting “through cooperative agreements” after “restoration projects”.

(b) DEFINITION OF ESTUARY HABITAT RESTORATION PLAN.—Section 103(6)(A) of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2902(6)(A)) is amended by striking “Federal or State” and inserting “Federal, State, or regional”.

(c) ESTUARY HABITAT RESTORATION PROGRAM.—Section 104 of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2903) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “through the award of contracts and cooperative agreements” after “assistance”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(A) by inserting “or State” after “Federal”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B) by inserting “or approach” after “technology”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Except” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) MONITORING.—

“(i) COSTS.—The costs of monitoring an estuary habitat restoration project funded under this title may be included in the total cost of the estuary habitat restoration project.

“(ii) GOALS.—The goals of the monitoring shall be—

“(I) to measure the effectiveness of the restoration project; and

“(II) to allow adaptive management to ensure project success.”;

(B) in paragraph (2) by inserting “or approach” after “technology”; and

(C) in paragraph (3) by inserting “(including monitoring)” after “services”;

(4) in subsection (f)(1)(B) by inserting “long-term” before “maintenance”; and

(5) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “In carrying” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) SMALL PROJECTS.—

“(A) SMALL PROJECT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘small project’ means a project carried out under this title with an estimated Federal cost of less than \$1,000,000.

“(B) DELEGATION OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, on recommendation of the Council, may delegate implementation of a small project to—

“(i) the Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service);

“(ii) the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere of the Department of Commerce;

“(iii) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; or

“(iv) the Secretary of Agriculture.

“(C) FUNDING.—A small project delegated to the head of a Federal department or agency under this paragraph may be carried out using funds appropriated to the department or agency under section 109(a)(1) or other funds available to the department or agency.

“(D) AGREEMENTS.—The head of a Federal department or agency to which a small project is delegated under this paragraph shall enter into an agreement with the non-Federal interest for the project generally in conformance with the criteria in subsections (d) and (e). Cooperative agreements may be used for any delegated project to allow the non-Federal interest to

carry out the project on behalf of the Federal agency.”.

(d) **ESTABLISHMENT OF ESTUARY HABITAT RESTORATION COUNCIL.**—Section 105(b) of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2904(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) cooperating in the implementation of the strategy developed under section 106;

“(7) recommending standards for monitoring for restoration projects and contribution of project information to the database developed under section 107; and

“(8) otherwise using the respective authorities of the Council members to carry out this title.”.

(e) **MONITORING OF ESTUARY HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECTS.**—Section 107(d) of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2906(d)) is amended by striking “compile” and inserting “have general data compilation, coordination, and analysis responsibilities to carry out this title and in support of the strategy developed under this section, including compilation of”.

(f) **REPORTING.**—Section 108(a) of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2907(a)) is amended by striking “At the end of the third and fifth fiscal years following the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “Not later than September 30, 2008, and every 2 years thereafter”.

(g) **FUNDING.**—Section 109(a) of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2908(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “to the Secretary”; and

(B) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (D) and inserting the following:

“(A) to the Secretary, \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012;

“(B) to the Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service), \$2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012;

“(C) to the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere of the Department of Commerce, \$2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012;

“(D) to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, \$2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012; and

“(E) to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.”; and

(2) in the first sentence of paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “and other information compiled under section 107” after “this title”; and

(B) by striking “2005” and inserting “2012”.

(h) **GENERAL PROVISIONS.**—Section 110 of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2909) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by inserting “or contracts” after “agreements”; and

(B) by inserting “, nongovernmental organizations,” after “agencies”; and

(2) by striking subsections (d) and (e).

**SEC. 5018. MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MITIGATION, RECOVERY, AND RESTORATION, IOWA, KANSAS, MISSOURI, MONTANA, NEBRASKA, NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, AND WYOMING.**

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee to be established under subsection (b)(1), shall conduct a study of the Missouri River and its tributaries to determine actions required—

(A) to mitigate losses of aquatic and terrestrial habitat;

(B) to recover federally listed species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) to restore the ecosystem to prevent further declines among other native species.

(2) **FUNDING.**—The study to be conducted under paragraph (1) shall be funded using amounts made available to carry out the Missouri River recovery and mitigation plan authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4143).

(b) **MISSOURI RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a committee to be known as the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee (in this section referred to as the “Committee”).

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Committee shall include representatives from—

(A) Federal agencies;

(B) States located near the Missouri River basin; and

(C) other appropriate entities, as determined by the Secretary, including—

(i) water management and fish and wildlife agencies;

(ii) Indian tribes located near the Missouri River basin; and

(iii) nongovernmental stakeholders, which may include—

(I) navigation interests;

(II) irrigation interests;

(III) flood control interests;

(IV) fish, wildlife, and conservation organizations;

(V) recreation interests; and

(VI) power supply interests.

(3) **DUTIES.**—The Committee shall—

(A) with respect to the study to be conducted under subsection (a)(1), provide guidance to the Secretary and any affected Federal agency, State agency, or Indian tribe; and

(B) provide guidance to the Secretary with respect to the Missouri River recovery and mitigation plan in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including recommendations relating to—

(i) changes to the implementation strategy from the use of adaptive management;

(ii) coordination of the development of consistent policies, strategies, plans, programs, projects, activities, and priorities for the Missouri River recovery and mitigation plan;

(iii) exchange of information regarding programs, projects, and activities of the agencies and entities represented on the Committee to promote the goals of the Missouri River recovery and mitigation plan;

(iv) establishment of such working groups as the Committee determines to be necessary to assist in carrying out the duties of the Committee, including duties relating to public policy and scientific issues;

(v) facilitating the resolution of interagency and intergovernmental conflicts between entities represented on the Committee associated with the Missouri River recovery and mitigation plan;

(vi) coordination of scientific and other research associated with the Missouri River recovery and mitigation plan; and

(vii) annual preparation of a work plan and associated budget requests.

(4) **RECOMMENDATIONS AND GUIDANCE.**—In providing recommendations and guidance from the Committee, the members of the Committee may include dissenting opinions.

(5) **COMPENSATION; TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—

(A) **COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Committee shall not receive compensation from the Secretary in carrying out the duties of the Committee under this section.

(B) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Travel expenses incurred by a member of the Committee in carrying out the duties of the Committee under this section shall not be eligible for Federal reimbursement.

(c) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Committee.

**SEC. 5019. SUSQUEHANNA, DELAWARE, AND POTOMAC RIVER BASINS, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA, AND VIRGINIA.**

(a) **EX OFFICIO MEMBER.**—Notwithstanding section 3001(a) of the 1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery From Natural Disasters, and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, Including Those in Bosnia (Public Law 105-18; 111 Stat. 176), section 2.2 of the Susquehanna River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 91-575 (84 Stat. 1512), and section 2.2 of the Delaware River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 87-328 (75 Stat. 691), beginning in fiscal year 2002, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Division Engineer, North Atlantic Division, Corps of Engineers—

(1) shall be—

(A) the ex officio United States member of the Susquehanna River Basin Compact and the Delaware River Basin Compact; and

(B) one of the 3 members appointed by the President under the Potomac River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 91-407 (84 Stat. 856);

(2) shall serve without additional compensation; and

(3) may designate an alternate member in accordance with the terms of those compacts.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION TO ALLOCATE.**—The Secretary shall allocate funds to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to fulfill the equitable funding requirements of the respective interstate compacts.

(c) **WATER SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION STORAGE, DELAWARE RIVER BASIN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Delaware River Basin Commission to provide temporary water supply and conservation storage at the Francis E. Walter Dam, Pennsylvania, for any period during which the Commission has determined that a drought warning or drought emergency exists.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The agreement shall provide that the cost for water supply and conservation storage under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the incremental operating costs associated with providing the storage.

(d) **WATER SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION STORAGE, SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Susquehanna River Basin Commission to provide temporary water supply and conservation storage at Federal facilities operated by the Corps of Engineers in the Susquehanna River basin for any period for which the Commission has determined that a drought warning or drought emergency exists.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The agreement shall provide that the cost for water supply and conservation storage under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the incremental operating costs associated with providing the storage.

(e) **WATER SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION STORAGE, POTOMAC RIVER BASIN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to provide temporary water supply and conservation storage at Federal facilities operated by the Corps of Engineers in the Potomac River basin for any period for which the Commission has determined that a drought warning or drought emergency exists.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The agreement shall provide that the cost for water supply and conservation storage under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the incremental operating costs associated with providing the storage.

**SEC. 5020. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.**

(a) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Section 510(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996

(110 Stat. 3759) is amended by striking “, and beneficial uses of dredged material” and inserting “, beneficial uses of dredged material, and restoration of submerged aquatic vegetation”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 510(i) of such Act (110 Stat. 3761) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”.

**SEC. 5021. CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RESTORATION, VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND.**

Section 704(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2263(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4);

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the second sentence by striking “\$30,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”; and

(B) in the third sentence by striking “Such projects” and inserting the following:

“(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—Such projects”;

(3) by striking paragraph (2)(D) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection) and inserting the following:

“(D) the restoration and rehabilitation of habitat for fish, including native oysters, in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries in Virginia and Maryland, including—

“(i) the construction of oyster bars and reefs;

“(ii) the rehabilitation of existing marginal habitat;

“(iii) the use of appropriate alternative substrate material in oyster bar and reef construction;

“(iv) the construction and upgrading of oyster hatcheries; and

“(v) activities relating to increasing the output of native oyster broodstock for seeding and monitoring of restored sites to ensure ecological success.

“(3) **RESTORATION AND REHABILITATION ACTIVITIES.**—The restoration and rehabilitation activities described in paragraph (2)(D) shall be—

“(A) for the purpose of establishing permanent sanctuaries and harvest management areas; and

“(B) consistent with plans and strategies for guiding the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay oyster resource and fishery.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **DEFINITION OF ECOLOGICAL SUCCESS.**—In this subsection, the term ‘ecological success’ means—

“(A) achieving a tenfold increase in native oyster biomass by the year 2010, from a 1994 baseline; and

“(B) the establishment of a sustainable fishery as determined by a broad scientific and economic consensus.”.

**SEC. 5022. HYPOXIA ASSESSMENT.**

The Secretary may participate with Federal, State, and local agencies, non-Federal and non-profit entities, regional researchers, and other interested parties to assess hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico.

**SEC. 5023. POTOMAC RIVER WATERSHED ASSESSMENT AND TRIBUTARY STRATEGY EVALUATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM.**

The Secretary may participate in the Potomac River watershed assessment and tributary strategy evaluation and monitoring program to identify a series of resource management indicators to accurately monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the agreed upon tributary strategies and other public policies that pertain to natural resource protection of the Potomac River watershed.

**SEC. 5024. LOCK AND DAM SECURITY.**

(a) **STANDARDS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Coast Guard, shall develop standards for the security of locks and dams, including the testing and certification of vessel exclusion barriers.

(b) **SITE SURVEYS.**—At the request of a lock or dam owner, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance, on a reimbursable basis, to improve lock or dam security.

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with a nonprofit alliance of public and private organizations that has the mission of promoting safe waterways and seaports to carry out testing and certification activities, and to perform site surveys, under this section.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 5025. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON SURVIVAL.**

Section 511 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 3301 note; 110 Stat. 3761; 113 Stat. 375) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(6) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2) by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

**SEC. 5026. WAGE SURVEYS.**

Employees of the Corps of Engineers who are paid wages determined under the last undesignated paragraph under the heading “Administrative Provisions” of chapter V of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1982 (5 U.S.C. 5343 note; 96 Stat. 832) shall be allowed, through appropriate employee organization representatives, to participate in wage surveys under such paragraph to the same extent as are prevailing rate employees under subsection (c)(2) of section 5343 of title 5, United States Code. Nothing in such section 5343 shall be construed to affect which agencies are to be surveyed under such paragraph.

**SEC. 5027. REHABILITATION.**

The Secretary, at Federal expense and in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, shall rehabilitate and improve the water-related infrastructure and the transportation infrastructure for the historic property in the Anacostia River watershed located in the District of Columbia, including measures to address wet weather conditions. To carry out this section, the Secretary shall accept funds provided for such project under any other Federal program.

**SEC. 5028. AUBURN, ALABAMA.**

The Secretary may provide technical assistance relating to water supply to Auburn, Alabama. There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 5029. PINHOOK CREEK, HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA.**

(a) **PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary shall design and construct the locally preferred plan for flood protection at Pinhook Creek, Huntsville, Alabama. In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, the existing detailed project report for the project prepared under the authority of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(b) **PARTICIPATION BY NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—The Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) if the detailed project report evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project.

(c) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

**SEC. 5030. ALASKA.**

Section 570 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 369) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c) by inserting “environmental restoration,” after “water supply and related facilities,”;

(2) in subsection (e)(3)(B) by striking the last sentence;

(3) in subsection (h) by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$45,000,000”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

“(j) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.**—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.”.

**SEC. 5031. BARROW, ALASKA.**

The Secretary shall carry out, under section 117 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (118 Stat. 2944), a non-structural project for coastal erosion and storm damage prevention and reduction at Barrow, Alaska, including relocation of infrastructure.

**SEC. 5032. LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, SEWARD, ALASKA.**

(a) **LONG-TERM MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR.**—

(1) **MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR.**—The Secretary shall assume responsibility for the long-term maintenance and repair of the Lowell Creek tunnel, Seward, Alaska.

(2) **DURATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibility of the Secretary for long-term maintenance and repair of the tunnel shall continue until an alternative method of flood diversion is constructed and operational under this section, or 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is earlier.

(b) **STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine whether an alternative method of flood diversion in Lowell Canyon is feasible.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **ALTERNATIVE METHODS.**—If the Secretary determines under the study conducted under subsection (b) that an alternative method of flood diversion in Lowell Canyon is feasible, the Secretary shall carry out the alternative method.

(2) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out an alternative method under paragraph (1) shall be the same as the Federal share of the cost of the construction of the Lowell Creek tunnel.

**SEC. 5033. ST. HERMAN AND ST. PAUL HARBORS, KODIAK, ALASKA.**

The Secretary shall carry out, on an emergency basis, necessary removal of rubble, sediment, and rock impeding the entrance to the St. Herman and St. Paul Harbors, Kodiak, Alaska, at a Federal cost of \$2,000,000.

**SEC. 5034. TANANA RIVER, ALASKA.**

The Secretary shall carry out, on an emergency basis, the removal of the hazard to navigation on the Tanana River, Alaska, near the mouth of the Chena River, as described in the January 3, 2005, memorandum from the Commander, Seventeenth Coast Guard District, to the Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, Anchorage, Alaska.

**SEC. 5035. WRANGELL HARBOR, ALASKA.**

(a) **GENERAL NAVIGATION FEATURES.**—In carrying out the project for navigation, Wrangell Harbor, Alaska, authorized by section 101(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 279), the Secretary shall consider the dredging of the mooring basin and construction of the inner harbor facilities to be general navigation features for purposes of estimating the non-Federal share of project costs.

(b) **REVISION OF PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary shall revise the partnership agreement for the project to reflect the change required by subsection (a).

**SEC. 5036. AUGUSTA AND CLARENDON, ARKANSAS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out rehabilitation of authorized and completed levees on the White River between Augusta and

Clarendon, Arkansas, at a total estimated cost of \$8,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$5,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,800,000.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—After performing the rehabilitation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall seek reimbursement from the Secretary of the Interior of an amount equal to the costs allocated to benefits to a Federal wildlife refuge of such rehabilitation.

**SEC. 5037. DES ARC LEVEE PROTECTION, ARKANSAS.**

The Secretary shall review the project for flood control, Des Arc, Arkansas, to determine whether bank and channel scour along the White River threaten the existing project and whether the scour is a result of a design deficiency. If the Secretary determines that such conditions exist as a result of a deficiency, the Secretary shall carry out measures to eliminate the deficiency.

**SEC. 5038. LOOMIS LANDING, ARKANSAS.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of shore damage in the vicinity of Loomis Landing, Arkansas, to determine if the damage is the result of a Federal navigation project, and, if the Secretary determines that the damage is the result of a Federal navigation project, the Secretary shall carry out a project to mitigate the damage under section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i).

**SEC. 5039. CALIFORNIA.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in California.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in California, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(c) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR WORK.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of the costs of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity.

(g) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of amounts made available to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

**SEC. 5040. CALAVERAS RIVER AND LITTLEJOHN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless the Secretary determines, by not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that the relocation of the portion of the project described in subsection (b)(2) would be injurious to the public interest, a non-Federal interest may reconstruct and relocate that portion of the project approximately 300 feet in a westerly direction.

(b) PROJECT DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project referred to in subsection (a) is the project for flood control, Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and tributaries, California, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 902).

(2) SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION.—The portion of the project to be reconstructed and relocated is that portion consisting of approximately 5.34 acres of dry land levee beginning at a point N. 2203542.3167, E. 6310930.1385, thence running west about 59.99 feet to a point N. 2203544.6562, E. 6310870.1468, thence running south about 3,874.99 feet to a point N. 2199669.8760, E. 6310861.7956, thence running east about 60.00 feet to a point N. 2199668.8026, E. 6310921.7900, thence running north about 3,873.73 feet to the point of origin.

(c) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of reconstructing and relocating the portion of the project described in subsection (b)(2) shall be 100 percent.

**SEC. 5041. CAMBRIA, CALIFORNIA.**

Section 219(f)(48) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (114 Stat. 2763A-220) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$10,300,000” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—\$10,300,000”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project not to exceed \$3,000,000 for the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.”; and

(3) by aligning the remainder of the text of subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) with subparagraph (B) (as added by paragraph (2) of this section).

**SEC. 5042. CONTRA COSTA CANAL, OAKLEY AND KNIGHTSEN, CALIFORNIA; MALLARD SLOUGH, PITTSBURG, CALIFORNIA.**

Sections 512 and 514 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2650) are each amended by adding at the end the following: “All planning, study, design, and construction on the project shall be carried out by the office of the district engineer, San Francisco, California.”.

**SEC. 5043. DANA POINT HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the causes of water quality degradation within Dana Point Harbor, California, to determine if the degradation is the result of a Federal navigation project, and, if the Secretary determines that the degradation is the result of a Federal navigation project, the Secretary shall carry out a project to mitigate the degradation at Federal expense.

**SEC. 5044. EAST SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**

Section 219(f)(22) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (113 Stat. 336) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—\$25,000,000”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

“(C) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal interest may provide any portion of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project in the form of in-kind services and materials.”; and

(3) by aligning the remainder of the text of subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) with subparagraph (B) (as added by paragraph (2) of this section).

**SEC. 5045. EASTERN SANTA CLARA BASIN, CALIFORNIA.**

Section 111(c) of the Miscellaneous Appropriations Act, 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-554; 114 Stat. 2763A-224) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$28,000,000”; and

(2) by striking “\$7,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

**SEC. 5046. LA-3 DREDGED MATERIAL OCEAN DISPOSAL SITE DESIGNATION, CALIFORNIA.**

The third sentence of section 102(c)(4) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1412(c)(4)) is amended by striking “January 1, 2003” and inserting “January 1, 2011”.

**SEC. 5047. LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.**

Section 219(f)(50) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (114 Stat. 2763A-220) is amended—

(1) by inserting after “water” the following: “and wastewater”; and

(2) by striking “\$14,500,000” and inserting “\$24,500,000”.

**SEC. 5048. LOS OSOS, CALIFORNIA.**

Section 219(c)(27) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (114 Stat. 2763A-219) is amended to read as follows:

“(27) LOS OSOS, CALIFORNIA.—Wastewater infrastructure, Los Osos, California.”.

**SEC. 5049. PINE FLAT DAM FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) COOPERATIVE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall participate with appropriate State and local agencies in the implementation of a cooperative program to improve and manage fisheries and aquatic habitat conditions in Pine Flat Reservoir and in the 14-mile reach of the Kings River immediately below Pine Flat Dam, California, in a manner that—

(A) provides for long-term aquatic resource enhancement; and

(B) avoids adverse effects on water storage and water rights holders.

(2) GOALS AND PRINCIPLES.—The cooperative program described in paragraph (1) shall be carried out—

(A) substantially in accordance with the goals and principles of the document entitled “Kings River Fisheries Management Program Framework Agreement” and dated May 29, 1999, between the California department of fish and game and the Kings River Water Association and the Kings River Conservation District; and

(B) in cooperation with the parties to that agreement.

(b) PARTICIPATION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In furtherance of the goals of the agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall participate in the planning, design, and construction of projects and pilot projects on the Kings River and its tributaries to enhance aquatic habitat and water availability for fisheries purposes (including maintenance of a trout fishery) in accordance with flood control operations, water rights, and beneficial uses in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PROJECTS.—Projects referred to in paragraph (1) may include—

(A) projects to construct or improve pumping, conveyance, and storage facilities to enhance water transfers; and

(B) projects to carry out water exchanges and create opportunities to use floodwater within and downstream of Pine Flat Reservoir.

(c) NO AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN DAM-RELATED PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any project for the raising of Pine Flat Dam or the construction of a multilevel intake structure at Pine Flat Dam.

(d) USE OF EXISTING STUDIES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall use, to the maximum extent practicable, studies in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including data and environmental documentation in the document entitled “Final Feasibility Report and Report of the Chief of Engineers for Pine Flat Dam Fish and Wildlife Habitat Restoration” and dated July 19, 2002.

(e) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of any project under subsection (b) the value, regardless of the date of acquisition, of any land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, or relocations provided by the non-Federal interest for use in carrying out the project.

(f) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of projects carried out under this section shall be a non-Federal responsibility.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

#### SEC. 5050. RAYMOND BASIN, SIX BASINS, CHINO BASIN, AND SAN GABRIEL BASIN, CALIFORNIA.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—The Secretary, in consultation and coordination with appropriate Federal, State, and local entities, shall develop a comprehensive plan for the management of water resources in the Raymond Basin, Six Basins, Chino Basin, and San Gabriel Basin, California. The Secretary may carry out activities identified in the comprehensive plan to demonstrate practicable alternatives for water resources management.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of operation and maintenance of any measures constructed under this section shall be 100 percent.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000.

#### SEC. 5051. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Port of San Francisco, California,

may carry out the project for repair and removal, as appropriate, of Piers 30–32, 35, 36, 70 (including Wharves 7 and 8), and 80 in San Francisco, California, substantially in accordance with the Port’s redevelopment plan.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 5052. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT AREA.

(a) AREA TO BE DECLARED NONNAVIGABLE; PUBLIC INTEREST.—Unless the Secretary finds, after consultation with local and regional public officials (including local and regional public planning organizations), that the proposed projects to be undertaken within the boundaries of the portion of the San Francisco, California, waterfront area described in subsection (b) are not in the public interest, such portion is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States.

(b) NORTHERN EMBARCADERO SOUTH OF BRYANT STREET.—The portion of the San Francisco, California, waterfront area referred to in subsection (a) is as follows: Beginning at the intersection of the northeasterly prolongation of that portion of the northwesterly line of Bryant Street lying between Beale Street and Main Street with the southwesterly line of Spear Street, which intersection lies on the line of jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission; following thence southerly along said line of jurisdiction as described in the State of California Harbor and Navigation Code Section 1770, as amended in 1961, to its intersection with the southeasterly line of Townsend Street; thence northeasterly along said southeasterly line of Townsend Street, to its intersection with a line that is parallel and distant 10 feet southerly from the existing southern boundary of Pier 40 produced; thence easterly along said parallel line, to its point of intersection with the United States Government Pierhead line; thence northerly along said Pierhead line to its intersection with a line parallel with, and distant 10 feet easterly from, the existing easterly boundary line of Pier 30–32; thence northerly along said parallel line and its northerly prolongation, to a point of intersection with a line parallel with, and distant 10 feet northerly from, the existing northerly boundary of Pier 30–32; thence westerly along last said parallel line to its intersection with the United States Government Pierhead line; thence northerly along said Pierhead line, to its intersection aforementioned northwesterly line of Bryant Street produced northeasterly; thence southwesterly along said northwesterly line of Bryant Street produced to the point of beginning.

(c) REQUIREMENT THAT AREA BE IMPROVED.—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) applies only to those parts of the area described in subsection (b) that are or will be bulkheaded, filled, or otherwise occupied by permanent structures and does not affect the applicability of any Federal statute or regulation applicable to such parts the day before the date of enactment of this Act, including sections 9 and 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401 and 403; 30 Stat. 1151), commonly known as the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(d) EXPIRATION DATE.—If, 20 years from the date of enactment of this Act, any area or part thereof described in subsection (b) is not bulkheaded or filled or occupied by permanent structures, including marina facilities, in accordance with the requirements set out in subsection (c), or if work in connection with any activity permitted in subsection (c) is not commenced within 5 years after issuance of such permits, then the declaration of nonnavigability for such area or part thereof shall expire.

#### SEC. 5053. SAN PABLO BAY, CALIFORNIA, WATERSHED AND SUISUN MARSH ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall complete work, as expeditiously as possible, on the ongoing San Pablo Bay watershed, California, study to determine the feasibility of opportunities for restoring, preserving, and protecting the San Pablo Bay watershed.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2008, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

(b) SUISUN MARSH, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study to determine the feasibility of opportunities for restoring, preserving, and protecting the Suisun Marsh, California.

(c) SAN PABLO AND SUISUN BAY MARSH WATERSHED CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in critical restoration projects that will produce, consistent with Federal programs, projects, and activities, immediate and substantial ecosystem restoration, preservation, and protection benefits in the following sub-watersheds of the San Pablo and Suisun Bay Marsh watersheds:

(A) The tidal areas of the Petaluma River, Napa-Sonoma Marsh.

(B) The shoreline of West Contra Costa County.

(C) Novato Creek.

(D) Suisun Marsh.

(E) Gallinas-Miller Creek.

(2) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—Participation in critical restoration projects under this subsection may include assistance for planning, design, or construction.

(d) CREDIT.—In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), the Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project under this section—

(1) the value of any lands, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, or relocations provided by the non-Federal interest for carrying out the project, regardless of the date of acquisition;

(2) funds received from the CALFED Bay-Delta program; and

(3) the cost of the studies, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

#### SEC. 5054. ST. HELENA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may construct a project for flood control and environmental restoration, St. Helena, California, substantially in accordance with the plan for the St. Helena comprehensive flood protection project dated 2006 and described in the addendum dated June 27, 2006, to the report prepared by the city of St. Helena entitled “City of St. Helena Comprehensive Flood Protection Project, Final Environmental Impact Report”, and dated January 2004, if the Secretary determines that the plans and designs for the project are feasible.

(b) COST.—The total cost of the project to be constructed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be \$30,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$19,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$10,500,000.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—The non-Federal interest shall be reimbursed for any work performed by the non-Federal interest for the project described in subsection (a) that is in excess of the required non-Federal contribution toward the total cost of the project, if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

#### SEC. 5055. UPPER CALAVERAS RIVER, STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA.

(a) REEVALUATION.—The Secretary shall reevaluate the feasibility of the Lower Mosher



Slough element and the levee extensions on the Upper Calaveras River element of the project for flood control, Stockton Metropolitan Area, California, carried out under section 211(f)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3683), to determine the eligibility of such elements for reimbursement under section 211 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b-13).

(b) **SPECIAL RULES FOR REEVALUATION.**—In conducting the reevaluation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall not reject a feasibility determination based on one or more of the policies of the Corps of Engineers concerning the frequency of flooding, the drainage area, and the amount of runoff.

(c) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If the Secretary determines that the elements referred to subsection (a) are feasible, the Secretary shall reimburse, subject to appropriations, the non-Federal interest under section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 for the Federal share of the cost of such elements.

**SEC. 5056. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) **RIO GRANDE COMPACT.**—The term “Rio Grande Compact” means the compact approved by Congress under the Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785), and ratified by the States.

(2) **RIO GRANDE BASIN.**—The term “Rio Grande Basin” means the Rio Grande (including all tributaries and their headwaters) located—

(A) in the State of Colorado, from the Rio Grande Reservoir, near Creede, Colorado, to the New Mexico State border;

(B) in the State of New Mexico, from the Colorado State border downstream to the Texas State border; and

(C) in the State of Texas, from the New Mexico State border to the southern terminus of the Rio Grande at the Gulf of Mexico.

(3) **STATES.**—The term “States” means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.

(b) **PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out, in the Rio Grande Basin—

(A) a program for the planning, construction, and evaluation of measures for fish and wildlife habitat rehabilitation and enhancement; and

(B) implementation of a long-term monitoring, computerized data inventory and analysis, applied research, and adaptive management program.

(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than December 31, 2008, and not later than December 31 of every sixth year thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States, shall submit to Congress a report that—

(A) contains an evaluation of the programs described in paragraph (1);

(B) describes the accomplishments of each program;

(C) provides updates of a systemic habitat needs assessment; and

(D) identifies any needed adjustments in the authorization of the programs.

(c) **STATE AND LOCAL CONSULTATION AND CO-OPERATIVE EFFORT.**—For the purpose of ensuring the coordinated planning and implementation of the programs described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the States, and other appropriate entities in the States, the rights and interests of which might be affected by specific program activities; and

(2) enter into an interagency agreement with the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the direct participation of, and transfer of funds to, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and any other agency or bureau of the Department of the Interior for the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation of those programs.

(d) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The costs of operation and maintenance of a project located on Federal land, or land owned or operated by a State or local government, shall be

borne by the Federal, State, or local agency that has jurisdiction over fish and wildlife activities on the land.

(e) **EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.**—

(1) **WATER LAW.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt any State water law.

(2) **COMPACTS AND DECREES.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with the Rio Grande Compact, and any applicable court decrees or Federal and State laws, affecting water or water rights in the Rio Grande Basin.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011.

**SEC. 5057. CHARLES HERVEY TOWNSHEND BREAKWATER, NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.**

The western breakwater for the project for navigation, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act of September 19, 1890 (26 Stat. 428), shall be known and designated as the “Charles Hervey Townshend Breakwater”.

**SEC. 5058. STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, and recreation components of the Mill River and Long Island Sound revitalization project, Stamford, Connecticut.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 5059. DELMARVA CONSERVATION CORRIDOR, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, AND VIRGINIA.**

(a) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to the Secretary of Agriculture for use in carrying out the Conservation Corridor Demonstration Program established under subtitle G of title II of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (16 U.S.C. 3801 note; 116 Stat. 275).

(b) **COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION.**—In carrying out water resources projects in the States on the Delmarva Peninsula, the Secretary shall coordinate and integrate those projects, to the maximum extent practicable, with any activities carried out to implement a conservation corridor plan approved by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 2602 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (16 U.S.C. 3801 note; 116 Stat. 275).

**SEC. 5060. ANACOSTIA RIVER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND.**

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE ACTION PLAN.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Mayor of the District of Columbia, the Governor of Maryland, the county executives of Montgomery County and Prince George’s County, Maryland, and other interested entities, shall develop and make available to the public a 10-year comprehensive action plan to provide for the restoration and protection of the ecological integrity of the Anacostia River and its tributaries.

(b) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—On completion of the comprehensive action plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make the plan available to the public, including on the Internet.

**SEC. 5061. EAST CENTRAL AND NORTHEAST FLORIDA.**

(a) **EAST CENTRAL AND NORTHEAST FLORIDA REGION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “East Central and Northeast Florida Region” means Flagler County, St. Johns County, Putnam County (east of the St. Johns River), Seminole County, Volusia County, the towns of Winter Park, Maitland, and Palatka, Florida.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the East Central and Northeast Florida Region.

(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-re-

lated environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in the East Central and Northeast Florida Region, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(d) **OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) **LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.**—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) **CREDIT FOR WORK.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) **CREDIT FOR INTEREST.**—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of the costs of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) **CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(g) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(h) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.**—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

(i) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

**SEC. 5062. FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS.**

Section 109 of the Miscellaneous Appropriations Act, 2001 (enacted into law by Public Law 106-554) (114 Stat. 2763A-222) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (e)(2) the following:

“(C) CREDIT FOR WORK PRIOR TO EXECUTION OF THE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project—

“(i) in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), the cost of construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project; and

“(ii) the cost of land acquisition carried out by the non-Federal interest for projects to be carried out under this section.”; and

(2) in subsection (f) by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000, of which not more than \$15,000,000 may be used to provide planning, design, and construction assistance to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority for a water treatment plant, Florida City, Florida”.

#### SEC. 5063. LAKE WORTH, FLORIDA.

The Secretary may carry out necessary repairs for the Lake Worth bulkhead replacement project, West Palm Beach, Florida, at an estimated total cost of \$9,000,000.

#### SEC. 5064. BIG CREEK, GEORGIA, WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AND RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may cooperate with, by providing technical, planning, and construction assistance to, the city of Roswell, Georgia, as the non-Federal interest and coordinator with other local governments in the Big Creek watershed, Georgia, to assess the quality and quantity of water resources, conduct comprehensive watershed management planning, develop and implement water efficiency technologies and programs, and plan, design, and construct water resource facilities to restore the watershed.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$5,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 5065. METROPOLITAN NORTH GEORGIA WATER PLANNING DISTRICT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in north Georgia, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, elimination or control of combined sewer overflows, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(c) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR WORK.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a project under this section, in an amount not to exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of the project, the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of the costs of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000.

#### SEC. 5066. SAVANNAH, GEORGIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After completion of a Savannah Riverfront plan, the Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, recreation, navigation, and flood damage reduction components of the plan.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with appropriate representatives in the vicinity of Savannah, Georgia, including the Georgia Ports Authority, the city of Savannah, and Camden County.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 5067. IDAHO, MONTANA, RURAL NEVADA, NEW MEXICO, RURAL UTAH, AND WYOMING.

Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 139; 117 Stat. 142; 117 Stat. 1836; 118 Stat. 440) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “AND RURAL UTAH” and inserting “RURAL UTAH, AND WYOMING”;

(2) in subsections (b) and (c) by striking “and rural Utah” each place it appears and inserting “rural Utah, and Wyoming”; and

(3) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001 \$150,000,000 for rural Nevada, \$25,000,000 for each of Montana and New Mexico, \$55,000,000 for Idaho, \$50,000,000 for rural Utah, and \$30,000,000 for Wyoming. Such sums shall remain available until expended.”

#### SEC. 5068. RILEY CREEK RECREATION AREA, IDAHO.

The Secretary is authorized to carry out the Riley Creek Recreation Area Operation Plan of the Albani Falls Management Plan, dated October 2001, for the Riley Creek Recreation Area, Albani Falls Dam, Bonner County, Idaho.

#### SEC. 5069. FLOODPLAIN MAPPING, LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide assistance for a project to develop maps identifying 100- and 500-year flood inundation areas along the Little Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Maps developed under the project shall include hydrologic and hydraulic information and shall accurately show the flood inundation of each property by flood risk in the floodplain. The maps shall be produced in a high resolution format and shall be made available to all flood prone areas along the Little Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, in an electronic format.

(c) PARTICIPATION OF FEMA.—The Secretary and the non-Federal interests for the project shall work with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to ensure the validity of the maps developed under the project for flood insurance purposes.

(d) FORMS OF ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the project, the Secretary may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with the non-Federal interests or provide reimbursements of project costs.

(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 50 percent.

(f) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the prioritization of map updates or the substantive requirements of the Federal Emergency Management Agency flood map modernization program authorized by section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000.

#### SEC. 5070. RECONSTRUCTION OF ILLINOIS AND MISSOURI FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in the reconstruction of an eligible flood control project if the Secretary determines that such reconstruction is not required as a result of improper operation and maintenance of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(b) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the costs for the reconstruction of a flood control project authorized by this section shall be the same non-Federal share that was applicable to construction of the project. The non-Federal interest shall be responsible for operation and maintenance and repair of a project for which reconstruction is undertaken under this section.

(c) RECONSTRUCTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “reconstruction”, as used with respect to a project, means addressing major project deficiencies caused by long-term degradation of the foundation, construction materials, or engineering systems or components of the project, the results of which render the project at risk of not performing in compliance with its authorized project purposes. In addressing such deficiencies, the Secretary may incorporate current design standards and efficiency improvements, including the replacement of obsolete mechanical and electrical components at pumping stations, if such incorporation does not significantly change the scope, function, and purpose of the project as authorized.

(d) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—The following flood control projects are eligible for reconstruction under this section:

(1) Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District, Illinois.

(2) Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing Drainage District, Illinois.

(3) Prairie Du Pont Levee and Sanitary District, including Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District, Illinois.

(4) Cairo, Illinois Mainline Levee, Cairo, Illinois.

(5) Goose Pond Pump Station, Cairo, Illinois.

(6) Cottonwood Slough Pump Station, Alexander County, Illinois.

(7) 10th and 28th Street Pump Stations, Cairo, Illinois.

(8) Flood control levee projects in Brookport, Shawneetown, Old Shawneetown, Golconda, Rosiclare, Harrisburg, and Reevesville, Illinois.

(9) City of St. Louis, Missouri.

(10) Missouri River Levee Drainage District, Missouri.

(e) **JUSTIFICATION.**—The reconstruction of a project authorized by this section shall not be considered a separable element of the project.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### **SEC. 5071. ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION.**

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION.**—Section 519(c)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2654) is amended by striking “2004” and inserting “2010”.

(b) **MAXIMUM FEDERAL SHARE.**—Section 519(c)(3) of such Act (114 Stat. 2654) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”.

(c) **IN-KIND SERVICES.**—Section 519(g)(3) of such Act (114 Stat. 2655) is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence “if such services are provided not more than 5 years before the date of initiation of the project or activity”.

(d) **MONITORING.**—Section 519 of such Act (114 Stat. 2654) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **MONITORING.**—The Secretary shall develop an Illinois River basin monitoring program to support the plan developed under subsection (b). Data collected under the monitoring program shall incorporate data provided by the State of Illinois and shall be publicly accessible through electronic means, including on the Internet.”.

#### **SEC. 5072. PROMONTORY POINT THIRD-PARTY REVIEW, CHICAGO SHORELINE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.**

(a) **REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a third-party review of the Promontory Point feature of the project for storm damage reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Lake Michigan, Illinois, from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State line, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664), at a cost not to exceed \$450,000.

(2) **JOINT REVIEW.**—The Buffalo and Seattle Districts of the Corps of Engineers shall jointly conduct the review under paragraph (1).

(3) **STANDARDS.**—The review under paragraph (1) shall be based on the standards under part 68 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(b) **CONTRIBUTIONS.**—The Secretary may accept funds from a State or political subdivision of a State to conduct the review under paragraph (1).

(c) **TREATMENT.**—The review under paragraph (1) shall not be considered to be an element of the project referred to in paragraph (1).

(d) **EFFECT OF SECTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the authorization for the project referred to in paragraph (1).

#### **SEC. 5073. KASKASKIA RIVER BASIN, ILLINOIS, RESTORATION.**

(a) **KASKASKIA RIVER BASIN DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Kaskaskia River Basin” means the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, its backwaters, its side channels, and all tributaries, including their watersheds, draining into the Kaskaskia River.

(b) **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT.**—The Secretary shall develop, as expeditiously as practicable, a comprehensive plan for the purpose of restoring, preserving, and protecting the Kaskaskia River Basin.

(2) **TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE APPROACHES.**—The comprehensive plan shall provide for the development of new technologies and innovative approaches—

(A) to enhance the Kaskaskia River as a transportation corridor;

(B) to improve water quality within the entire Kaskaskia River Basin;

(C) to restore, enhance, and preserve habitat for plants and wildlife;

(D) to ensure aquatic integrity of side channels and backwaters and their connectivity with the mainstem river;

(E) to increase economic opportunity for agriculture and business communities; and

(F) to reduce the impacts of flooding to communities and landowners.

(3) **SPECIFIC COMPONENTS.**—The comprehensive plan shall include such features as are necessary to provide for—

(A) the development and implementation of a program for sediment removal technology, sediment characterization, sediment transport, and beneficial uses of sediment;

(B) the development and implementation of a program for the planning, conservation, evaluation, and construction of measures for fish and wildlife habitat conservation and rehabilitation, and stabilization and enhancement of land and water resources in the Kaskaskia River Basin;

(C) the development and implementation of a long-term resource monitoring program for the Basin;

(D) a conveyance study of the Kaskaskia River floodplain from Vandalia, Illinois, to Carlyle Lake to determine the impacts of existing and future waterfowl improvements on flood stages, including detailed surveys and mapping information to ensure proper hydraulic and hydrological analysis;

(E) the development and implementation of a computerized inventory and analysis system for the Basin;

(F) the development and implementation of a systemic plan for the Basin to reduce flood impacts by means of ecosystem restoration projects; and

(G) the study and design of necessary measures to reduce ongoing headcutting and restore the aquatic environment of the Basin that has been degraded by the headcutting that has occurred above the existing grade control structure.

(4) **CONSULTATION.**—The comprehensive plan shall be developed by the Secretary in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, the State of Illinois, and the Kaskaskia River Watershed Association.

(5) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the comprehensive plan.

(6) **ADDITIONAL STUDIES AND ANALYSES.**—After submission of a report under paragraph (5), the Secretary shall conduct studies and analyses of projects related to the comprehensive plan that are appropriate and consistent with this subsection.

(c) **GENERAL PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **WATER QUALITY.**—In carrying out activities under this section, the Secretary's recommendations shall be consistent with applicable State water quality standards.

(2) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—In developing the comprehensive plan under subsection (b), the Secretary shall implement procedures to facilitate public participation, including providing advance notice of meetings, providing adequate opportunity for public input and comment, maintaining appropriate records, and making a record of the proceedings of meetings available for public inspection.

(d) **CRITICAL PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES.**—If the Secretary, in cooperation with appropriate Federal agencies and the State of Illinois, determines that a project or initiative for the Kaskaskia River Basin will produce independent, immediate, and substantial benefits, the Secretary may proceed with the implementation of the project.

(e) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall integrate activities carried out under this section with ongoing Federal and State programs, projects, and activities, including the following:

(1) Farm programs of the Department of Agriculture.

(2) Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (State of Illinois) and Conservation 2000 Ecosystem Program of the Illinois department of natural resources.

(3) Conservation 2000 Conservation Practices Program and the Livestock Management Facilities Act administered by the Illinois department of agriculture.

(4) National Buffer Initiative of the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

(5) Nonpoint source grant program administered by the Illinois environmental protection agency.

(6) Other programs that may be developed by the State of Illinois or the Federal Government, or that are carried out by nonprofit organizations, to carry out the objectives of the Kaskaskia River Basin Comprehensive Plan.

(f) **IN-KIND SERVICES.**—The Secretary may credit the cost of in-kind services provided by the non-Federal interest for an activity carried out under this section toward not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share of the cost of the activity. In-kind services shall include all State funds expended on programs that accomplish the goals of this section, as determined by the Secretary. The programs may include the Kaskaskia River Conservation Reserve Program, the Illinois Conservation 2000 Program, the Open Lands Trust Fund, and other appropriate programs carried out in the Kaskaskia River Basin.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### **SEC. 5074. SOUTHWEST ILLINOIS.**

(a) **SOUTHWEST ILLINOIS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Southwest Illinois” means the counties of Madison, St. Clair, Monroe, Randolph, Perry, Franklin, Jackson, Union, Alexander, Pulaski, and Williamson, Illinois.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Southwest Illinois.

(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Southwest Illinois, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

(d) **OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) **LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.**—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR WORK.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(F) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(G) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(H) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

(I) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

#### SEC. 5075. CALUMET REGION, INDIANA.

Section 219(f)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (113 Stat. 335; 117 Stat. 1843) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$30,000,000” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—\$100,000,000”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.”; and

(3) by aligning the remainder of the text of subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) with subparagraph (B) (as added by paragraph (2) of this section).

#### SEC. 5076. FLOODPLAIN MAPPING, MISSOURI RIVER, IOWA.

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide assistance for a project to develop maps identifying 100- and 500-year flood inundation areas in the State of Iowa, along the Missouri River.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Maps developed under the project shall include hydrologic and hydraulic information and shall accurately portray the flood hazard areas in the floodplain. The maps shall be produced in a high resolution format and shall be made available to the State of Iowa in an electronic format.

(C) PARTICIPATION OF FEMA.—The Secretary and the non-Federal interests for the project shall work with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to ensure the validity of the maps developed under the project for flood insurance purposes.

(D) FORMS OF ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the project, the Secretary may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with the non-Federal interests or provide reimbursements of project costs.

(E) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 50 percent.

(F) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the prioritization of map updates or the substantive requirements of the Federal Emergency Management Agency flood map modernization program authorized by section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101).

(G) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,000,000.

#### SEC. 5077. PADUCAH, KENTUCKY.

The Secretary shall complete a feasibility report for rehabilitation of the project for flood damage reduction, Paducah, Kentucky, authorized by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1217), and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary may carry out the project at a total cost of \$3,000,000.

#### SEC. 5078. SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY.

Section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3773; 113 Stat. 348; 117 Stat. 142) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.”.

#### SEC. 5079. WINCHESTER, KENTUCKY.

Section 219(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 114 Stat. 2763A-219) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(41) WINCHESTER, KENTUCKY.—Wastewater infrastructure, Winchester, Kentucky.”.

#### SEC. 5080. BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA.

Section 219(f)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A-220) is amended by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$35,000,000”.

#### SEC. 5081. CALCASIEU SHIP CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall expedite completion of a dredged material management plan for the Calcasieu Ship Channel, Louisiana, and may take interim measures to increase the capacity of existing disposal areas, or to construct new confined or beneficial use disposal areas, for the channel.

#### SEC. 5082. EAST ATCHAFALAYA BASIN AND AMITE RIVER BASIN REGION, LOUISIANA.

(A) EAST ATCHAFALAYA BASIN AND AMITE RIVER BASIN REGION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “East Atchafalaya Basin and Amite River Basin Region” means the following parishes and municipalities in the State of Louisiana: Ascension, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberville, Livingston, Pointe Coupee, St. Helena, West Baton Rouge, and West Feliciana.

(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the East Atchafalaya Basin and Amite River Basin Region.

(C) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in the East Atchafalaya Basin and Amite River Basin Region, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(D) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(E) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each partnership agreement of a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR WORK.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(F) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(G) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(H) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

(I) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

#### SEC. 5083. INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK PROJECT, LOUISIANA.

Not later than July 1, 2008, the Secretary shall—

(1) issue a final environmental impact statement relating to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock project, Louisiana; and

(2) develop and maintain a transportation mitigation program relating to that project in coordination with—

(A) St. Bernard Parish;

- (B) Orleans Parish;  
 (C) the Old Arabi Neighborhood Association;  
 and  
 (D) other interested parties.

**SEC. 5084. LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LOUISIANA.**

For purposes of carrying out section 121 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1273), the Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, basin stakeholders conference convened by the Environmental Protection Agency, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and United States Geological Survey on February 25, 2002, shall be treated as being a management conference convened under section 320 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330).

**SEC. 5085. SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA REGION, LOUISIANA.**

(a) **DEFINITION OF SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA REGION.**—In this section, the term “Southeast Louisiana Region” means any of the following parishes and municipalities in the State of Louisiana:

- (1) Orleans.
- (2) Jefferson.
- (3) St. Tammany.
- (4) Tangipahoa.
- (5) St. Bernard.
- (6) St. Charles.
- (7) St. John.
- (8) Plaquemines.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the Southeast Louisiana Region.

(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in the Southeast Louisiana Region, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development (including projects to improve water quality in the Lake Pontchartrain basin).

(d) **OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) **LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.**—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

- (i) shall be 75 percent; and
- (ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) **CREDIT FOR WORK.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) **CREDIT FOR INTEREST.**—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of the costs of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) **CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(F) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(G) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(H) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.**—Not more than 10 percent of amounts made available to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

(I) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$17,000,000.

**SEC. 5086. WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LOUISIANA.**

(a) **MODIFICATION OF STUDY.**—The study for the project for waterfront and riverine preservation, restoration, and enhancement, Mississippi River, West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, being carried out under Committee Resolution 2570 of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted July 23, 1998, is modified to add West Feliciana Parish and East Baton Rouge Parish to the geographic scope of the study.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The Secretary may, upon completion of the study, participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, and recreation components of the project.

(c) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(d) **EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.**—Section 517(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 345) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) Mississippi River, West Baton Rouge, West Feliciana, and East Baton Rouge Parishes, Louisiana, project for waterfront and riverine preservation, restoration, and enhancement modifications.”

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000.

**SEC. 5087. CHARLESTOWN, MARYLAND.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out a project for nonstructural flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration at Charlestown, Maryland.

(b) **LAND ACQUISITION.**—The flood damage reduction component of the project may include the acquisition of private property from willing sellers.

(c) **JUSTIFICATION.**—Any nonstructural flood damage reduction project to be carried out under this section that will result in the conversion of property to use for ecosystem restoration and wildlife habitat shall be justified based on national ecosystem restoration benefits.

(d) **USE OF ACQUIRED PROPERTY.**—Property acquired under this section shall be maintained

in public ownership for ecosystem restoration and wildlife habitat.

(e) **ABILITY TO PAY.**—In determining the appropriate non-Federal cost share for the project, the Secretary shall determine the ability of Cecil County, Maryland, to participate as a cost-sharing non-Federal interest in accordance with section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 5088. ST. MARY'S RIVER, MARYLAND.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out the project for shoreline protection, St. Mary's River, Maryland, under section 3 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g).

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—In carrying out the project under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use funds made available for such project under Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–103).

**SEC. 5089. MASSACHUSETTS DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITES.**

The Secretary may cooperate with Massachusetts in the management and long-term monitoring of aquatic dredged material disposal sites within the State and is authorized to accept funds from the State to carry out such activities.

**SEC. 5090. ONTONAGON HARBOR, MICHIGAN.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of shore damage in the vicinity of the project for navigation, Ontonagon Harbor, Ontonagon County, Michigan, authorized by section 101 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1176) and reauthorized by section 363 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3730), to determine if the damage is the result of a Federal navigation project, and, if the Secretary determines that the damage is the result of a Federal navigation project, the Secretary shall carry out a project to mitigate the damage under section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i).

**SEC. 5091. CROOKSTON, MINNESOTA.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study for a project for emergency streambank protection along the Red Lake River in Crookston, Minnesota, and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary may carry out the project under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r); except that the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project shall be \$6,500,000.

**SEC. 5092. GARRISON AND KATHIO TOWNSHIP, MINNESOTA.**

(a) **PROJECT DESCRIPTION.**—Section 219(f)(61) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (114 Stat. 2763A–221) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading by striking “AND KATHIO TOWNSHIP” and inserting “, CROW WING COUNTY, MILLE LACS COUNTY, MILLE LACS INDIAN RESERVATION, AND KATHIO TOWNSHIP”;

(2) by striking “\$11,000,000” and inserting “\$17,000,000”;

(3) by inserting “, Crow Wing County, Mille Lacs County, Mille Lacs Indian Reservation established by the treaty of February 22, 1855 (10 Stat. 1165),” after “Garrison”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following: “Such assistance shall be provided directly to the Garrison-Kathio-West Mille Lacs Lake Sanitary District, Minnesota, except for assistance provided directly to the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe at the discretion of the Secretary.”

(b) **PROCEDURES.**—In carrying out the project authorized by such section 219(f)(61), the Secretary may use the cost sharing and contracting procedures available to the Secretary under section 569 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 368).

**SEC. 5093. ITASCA COUNTY, MINNESOTA.**

The Secretary shall carry out a project for flood damage reduction, Trout Lake and



Canisteo Pit, Itasca County, Minnesota, without regard to normal policy considerations.

**SEC. 5094. MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA.**

(a) **CONVEYANCE.**—The Secretary shall convey to the city of Minneapolis by quitclaim deed and without consideration all right, title, and interest of the United States to the property known as the War Department (Fort Snelling Interceptor) Tunnel in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.**—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to the conveyance under this section.

**SEC. 5095. NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 569 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 368) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “Benton, Sherburne,” and inserting “Beltrami, Hubbard, Wadena,”;

(2) by striking the last sentence of subsection (e)(3)(B);

(3) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

“(g) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.”;

(4) in subsection (h) by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$54,000,000”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.**—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.”.

(b) **BIWABIK, MINNESOTA.**—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the project for environmental infrastructure, Biwabik, Minnesota, carried out under section 569 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 368), for planning, design, and construction costs that were incurred by the non-Federal interest with respect to the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project and that were in excess of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project if the Secretary determines that the costs are appropriate.

**SEC. 5096. WILD RICE RIVER, MINNESOTA.**

The Secretary shall expedite the completion of the general reevaluation report, authorized by section 438 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2640), for the project for flood protection, Wild Rice River, Minnesota, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1825), to develop alternatives to the Twin Valley Lake feature, and upon the completion of such report, shall construct the project at a total cost of \$20,000,000.

**SEC. 5097. MISSISSIPPI.**

Section 592(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 380; 117 Stat. 1837) is amended by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$110,000,000”.

**SEC. 5098. HARRISON, HANCOCK, AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MISSISSIPPI.**

In carrying out projects for the protection, restoration, and creation of aquatic and ecologically related habitats located in Harrison, Hancock, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi, under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326), the Secretary shall accept any portion of the non-Federal share of the cost of the projects in the form of in-kind services and materials.

**SEC. 5099. MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS.**

As a part of the operation and maintenance of the project for the Mississippi River (Regulating Works), between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Missouri and Illinois, authorized by the first section of an Act entitled “Making appropria-

tions for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 630), the Secretary may carry out activities necessary to restore and protect fish and wildlife habitat in the middle Mississippi River system. Such activities may include modification of navigation training structures, modification and creation of side channels, modification and creation of islands, and studies and analysis necessary to apply adaptive management principles in design of future work.

**SEC. 5100. ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.**

Section 219(f)(32) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (113 Stat. 337) is amended—

(1) by striking “a project” and inserting “projects”;

(2) by striking “\$15,000,000” and inserting “\$35,000,000”; and

(3) by inserting “and St. Louis County” before “, Missouri”.

**SEC. 5101. ST. LOUIS REGIONAL GREENWAYS, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, recreation, and flood damage reduction components of the St. Louis Regional Greenways Proposal of the Metropolitan Park and Recreation District, St. Louis, Missouri, dated March 31, 2004.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with appropriate representatives in the vicinity of St. Louis, Missouri, including the Metropolitan Park and Recreation District, the city of St. Louis, St. Louis County, and St. Charles County.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 5102. MISSOULA, MONTANA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, flood damage reduction, and recreation components of the Clark Fork River Revitalization Project, Missoula, Montana.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out this section.

**SEC. 5103. ST. MARY PROJECT, GLACIER COUNTY, MONTANA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation, shall conduct all necessary studies, develop an emergency response plan, provide technical and planning and design assistance, and rehabilitate and construct the St. Mary Diversion and Conveyance Works project located within the exterior boundaries of the Blackfeet Reservation in the State of Montana, at a total cost of \$153,000,000.

(b) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of the total cost of the project under this section shall be 75 percent.

(c) **PARTICIPATION BY BLACKFEET TRIBE AND FORT BELKNAP INDIAN COMMUNITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no construction shall be carried out under this section until the earlier of—

(A) the date on which Congress approves the reserved water rights settlements of the Blackfeet Tribe and the Fort Belnap Indian Community; and

(B) January 1, 2011.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to construction relating to—

(A) standard operation and maintenance; or

(B) emergency repairs to ensure water transportation or the protection of life and property.

(3) **REQUIREMENT.**—The Blackfeet Tribe shall be a participant in all phases of the project authorized by this section.

**SEC. 5104. LOWER PLATTE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, NEBRASKA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may cooperate with and provide assistance to the Lower

Platte River natural resources districts in the State of Nebraska to serve as non-Federal interests with respect to—

(1) conducting comprehensive watershed planning in the natural resource districts;

(2) assessing water resources in the natural resource districts; and

(3) providing project feasibility planning, design, and construction assistance for water resource and watershed management in the natural resource districts, including projects for environmental restoration and flood damage reduction.

(b) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity described in subsection (a)(1) shall be 75 percent.

(2) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity described in subsection (a) may be provided in cash or in kind.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$12,000,000.

**SEC. 5105. HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS AREA, NEW JERSEY.**

Section 324 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4849; 110 Stat. 3779) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “design” and inserting “planning, design,”; and

(B) by striking “Hackensack Meadows Development” and all that follows through “Plan for” and inserting “New Jersey Meadowslands Commission for the development of an environmental improvement program for”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading by striking “REQUIRED”;

(B) by striking “shall” and inserting “may”;;

(C) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) Restoration and acquisitions of significant wetlands and aquatic habitat that contribute to the Meadowslands ecosystem.”;

(D) in paragraph (2) by inserting “and aquatic habitat” before the period at the end; and

(E) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) Research, development, and implementation for a water quality improvement program, including restoration of hydrology and tidal flows and remediation of hot spots and other sources of contaminants that degrade existing or planned sites.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “non-Federal interest”; and

(B) by inserting before the last sentence the following: “The non-Federal interest may also provide in-kind services not to exceed the non-Federal share of the total project cost.”;

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a project to be carried out under the program developed under subsection (a) the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.”; and

(6) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (4) of this subsection) by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”.

**SEC. 5106. ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK.**

(a) **DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM.**—Section 404(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4863) is amended—

(1) by striking “processes” and inserting “and related environmental processes”;

(2) by inserting after “Atlantic Coast” the following: “(and associated back bays)”;



(3) by inserting after "actions" the following: "environmental restoration or conservation measures for coastal and back bays."; and

(4) by adding at the end the following: "The plan for collecting data and monitoring information included in such annual report shall be coordinated with and agreed to by appropriate agencies of the State of New York."

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 404(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "INITIAL PLAN.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the" and inserting "ANNUAL REPORTS.—The";

(2) by striking "initial plan for data collection and monitoring" and inserting "annual report of data collection and monitoring activities"; and

(3) by striking the last sentence.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 404(c) of such Act (113 Stat. 341) is amended by striking "and an additional total of \$2,500,000 for fiscal years thereafter" and inserting "\$2,500,000 for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and \$7,500,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004,".

(d) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—Section 404 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4863) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$800,000 for the Secretary to carry out a project for a tsunami warning system, Atlantic Coast of New York."

#### SEC. 5107. COLLEGE POINT, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK.

In carrying out section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4639), the Secretary shall give priority to work in College Point, New York City, New York.

#### SEC. 5108. FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for ecosystem restoration, Flushing Bay and Creek, New York City, New York, the cost of design and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

#### SEC. 5109. HUDSON RIVER, NEW YORK.

The Secretary may participate with the State of New York, New York City, and the Hudson River Park Trust in carrying out activities to restore critical marine habitat, improve safety, and protect and rehabilitate critical infrastructure with respect to the Hudson River. There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 5110. MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NEW YORK.

As part of the operation and maintenance of the Mount Morris Dam, New York, the Secretary may make improvements to the access road for the dam to provide safe access to a Federal visitor's center.

#### SEC. 5111. NORTH HEMPSTEAD AND GLEN COVE NORTH SHORE WATERSHED RESTORATION, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, and recreation components of the North Hempstead and Glen Cove North Shore watershed restoration, New York.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 5112. ROCHESTER, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, and recreation components of the Port of Rochester waterfront revitalization project, Rochester, New York.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### SEC. 5113. NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a program to provide envi-

ronmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the State of North Carolina.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in North Carolina, including projects for—

(1) wastewater treatment and related facilities;

(2) combined sewer overflow, water supply, storage, treatment, and related facilities;

(3) drinking water infrastructure including treatment and related facilities;

(4) environmental restoration;

(5) stormwater infrastructure; and

(6) surface water resource protection and development.

(c) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities development plan or resource protection plan, including appropriate plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR WORK.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project, in an amount not to exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of the project, the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of the costs of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land).

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$13,000,000.

#### SEC. 5114. STANLY COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.

Section 219(f)(64) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (114 Stat. 2763A-221) is

amended by inserting "water and" before "wastewater".

#### SEC. 5115. JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, NORTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall expedite the completion of the calculations necessary to negotiate and execute a revised, permanent contract for water supply storage at John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, North Carolina, among the Secretary and the Kerr Lake Regional Water System and the city of Henderson, North Carolina.

#### SEC. 5116. CINCINNATI, OHIO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may undertake the ecosystem restoration and recreation components of the Central Riverfront Park Master Plan, dated December 1999, at a total cost of \$30,000,000.

(b) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

#### SEC. 5117. OHIO RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) OHIO RIVER BASIN.—The term "Ohio River Basin" means the Ohio River, its backwaters, its side channels, and all tributaries (including their watersheds) that drain into the Ohio River and encompassing areas of any of the States of Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, New York, and Virginia.

(2) COMPACT.—The term "Compact" means the Ohio River Watershed Sanitation Commission flood and pollution control compact between the States of Indiana, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, and Virginia, to which consent was given by Congress pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 752) and that was chartered in 1948.

(b) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide planning, design, and construction assistance to the Compact for the improvement of the quality of the environment in and along the Ohio River Basin.

(c) PRIORITIES.—In providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to reducing or eliminating the presence of organic pollutants in the Ohio River Basin through the renovation and technological improvement of the organic detection system monitoring stations along the Ohio River in the States of Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,500,000.

#### SEC. 5118. TOUSSAINT RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, CARROLL TOWNSHIP, OHIO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The costs of operation and maintenance activities for the Toussaint River Federal navigation project, Carroll Township, Ohio, that are carried out in accordance with section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) and relate directly to the presence of unexploded ordnance, shall be carried out at Federal expense.

(b) CALCULATION OF TOTAL COSTS.—The Secretary shall not consider the additional costs of dredging due to the presence of unexploded ordnance when calculating the costs of the project referred to in subsection (a) for the purposes of section 107(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 577(b)).

#### SEC. 5119. STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE WATER PLANNING, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance for the development of updates of the Oklahoma comprehensive water plan.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Technical assistance provided under subsection (a) may include—

(1) acquisition of hydrologic data, ground-water characterization, database development, and data distribution;

(2) expansion of surface water and ground-water monitoring networks;

(3) assessment of existing water resources, surface water storage, and groundwater storage potential;

(4) numerical analysis and modeling necessary to provide an integrated understanding of water resources and water management options;

(5) participation in State planning forums and planning groups;

(6) coordination of Federal water management planning efforts; and

(7) technical review of data, models, planning scenarios, and water plans developed by the State.

(c) **ALLOCATION.**—The Secretary shall allocate, subject to the availability of appropriations, \$6,500,000 to provide technical assistance and for the development of updates of the Oklahoma comprehensive water plan.

(d) **COST SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this section—

(1) shall be 25 percent; and

(2) may be in the form of cash or any in-kind services that the Secretary determines would contribute substantially toward the conduct and completion of the activity assisted.

#### **SEC. 5120. FERN RIDGE DAM, OREGON.**

The Secretary may treat all work carried out for emergency corrective actions to repair the embankment dam at the Fern Ridge Lake project, Oregon, as a dam safety project. The cost of work carried out may be recovered in accordance with section 1203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 467n; 100 Stat. 4263).

#### **SEC. 5121. ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.**

Section 219(f)(66) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (114 Stat. 2763A–221) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—\$20,000,000”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.”; and

(3) by aligning the remainder of the text of subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) with subparagraph (B) (as added by paragraph (2) of this section).

#### **SEC. 5122. CLINTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.**

Section 219(f)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (113 Stat. 335) is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$2,000,000”.

#### **SEC. 5123. KEHLY RUN DAMS, PENNSYLVANIA.**

Section 504(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 338; 117 Stat. 1842) is amended by striking “Dams” and inserting “Dams No. 1–5”.

#### **SEC. 5124. LEHIGH RIVER, LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The Secretary shall use existing water quality data to model the effects of the Francis E. Walter Dam, at different water levels, to determine its impact on water and related resources in and along the Lehigh River in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania. There is authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 to carry out this section.

#### **SEC. 5125. NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA.**

Section 219(f)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (113 Stat. 335) is amended by striking “and Monroe” and inserting “Northumberland, Union, Snyder, Luzerne, and Monroe”.

#### **SEC. 5126. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK.**

(a) **STUDY AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 567(a) of the Water Resources Develop-

ment Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3787; 114 Stat. 2662) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “and carry out” after “develop”; and  
(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “\$10,000,000.” and inserting “\$20,000,000, of which the Secretary may utilize not more than \$5,000,000 to design and construct feasible pilot projects during the development of the strategy to demonstrate alternative approaches for the strategy. The total cost for any single pilot project may not exceed \$500,000. The Secretary shall evaluate the results of the pilot projects and consider the results in the development of the strategy.”

(b) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—Section 567(c) of such Act (114 Stat. 2662) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking “COOPERATION” and inserting “PARTNERSHIP”; and  
(2) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting “and carrying out” after “developing”; and

(B) by striking “cooperation” and inserting “cost-sharing and partnership”.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGY.**—Section 567(d) of such Act (114 Stat. 2663) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary”;

(2) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking “implement” and inserting “carry out”; and

(B) by striking “implementing” and inserting “carrying out”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **PRIORITY PROJECT.**—In carrying out projects to implement the strategy, the Secretary shall give priority to the project for ecosystem restoration, Cooperstown, New York, described in the Upper Susquehanna River Basin—Cooperstown Area Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study, dated December 2004, prepared by the Corps of Engineers and the New York State department of environmental conservation.”; and

(4) by aligning the remainder of the text of paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) with paragraph (2) (as added by paragraph (3) of this subsection).

(d) **CREDIT.**—Section 567 of such Act (110 Stat. 3787; 114 Stat. 2662) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

“(1) in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), the cost of design and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project; and

“(2) the cost of in-kind services and materials provided for the project by the non-Federal interest.”.

#### **SEC. 5127. CANO MARTIN PENA, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.**

The Secretary shall review a report prepared by the non-Federal interest concerning flood protection and environmental restoration for Cano Martin Pena, San Juan, Puerto Rico, and, if the Secretary determines that the report meets the evaluation and design standards of the Corps of Engineers and that the project is feasible, the Secretary may carry out the project at a total cost of \$150,000,000.

#### **SEC. 5128. LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.**

Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A–220; 117 Stat. 1838) is amended by striking “\$35,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”.

#### **SEC. 5129. CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE, AND TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION, SOUTH DAKOTA.**

(a) **DISBURSEMENT PROVISIONS OF STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA AND CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE AND LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION TRUST**

**FUNDS.**—Section 602(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 386) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i) by inserting “and the Secretary of the Treasury” after “Secretary”; and

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—On notification in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the State of South Dakota funds from the State of South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund established under section 603 to be used to carry out the plan for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration submitted by the State of South Dakota after the State certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury that the funds to be disbursed will be used in accordance with section 603(d)(3) and only after the Trust Fund is fully capitalized.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—On notification in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe funds from the Cheyenne River Sioux Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund and the Lower Brule Sioux Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund, respectively, established under section 604, to be used to carry out the plans for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration submitted by the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, respectively, to after the respective tribe certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury that the funds to be disbursed will be used in accordance with section 604(d)(3) and only after the Trust Fund is fully capitalized.”.

(b) **INVESTMENT PROVISIONS OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE RESTORATION TRUST FUND.**—Section 603 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 388; 114 Stat. 2664) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) **INVESTMENTS.**—

“(1) **ELIGIBLE OBLIGATIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury shall invest the amounts deposited under subsection (b) and the interest earned on those amounts only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States issued directly to the Fund.

“(2) **INVESTMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest the amounts in the Fund in accordance with the requirements of this paragraph.

“(B) **SEPARATE INVESTMENTS OF PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST.**—

“(i) **PRINCIPAL ACCOUNT.**—The amounts deposited in the Fund under subsection (b) shall be credited to an account within the Fund (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘principal account’) and invested as provided in subparagraph (C).

“(ii) **INTEREST ACCOUNT.**—The interest earned from investing amounts in the principal account of the Fund shall be transferred to a separate account within the Fund (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘interest account’) and invested as provided in subparagraph (D).

“(iii) **CREDITING.**—The interest earned from investing amounts in the interest account of the Fund shall be credited to the interest account.

“(C) **INVESTMENT OF PRINCIPAL ACCOUNT.**—

“(i) **INITIAL INVESTMENT.**—Each amount deposited in the principal account of the Fund shall be invested initially in eligible obligations having the shortest maturity then available until the date on which the amount is divided into 3 substantially equal portions and those portions are invested in eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to the next-issued publicly issued Treasury obligations having a 2-year maturity, a 5-year maturity, and a 10-year maturity, respectively.

“(ii) **SUBSEQUENT INVESTMENT.**—As each 2-year, 5-year, and 10-year eligible obligation matures, the principal of the maturing eligible obligation shall also be invested initially in the shortest-maturity eligible obligation then available until the principal is reinvested substantially equally in the eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to the next-issued publicly issued Treasury obligations having 2-year, 5-year, and 10-year maturities.

“(iii) **DISCONTINUANCE OF ISSUANCE OF OBLIGATIONS.**—If the Department of the Treasury discontinues issuing to the public obligations having 2-year, 5-year, or 10-year maturities, the principal of any maturing eligible obligation shall be reinvested substantially equally in eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to the next-issued publicly issued Treasury obligations of the maturities longer than 1 year then available.

“(D) **INVESTMENT OF INTEREST ACCOUNT.**—

“(i) **BEFORE FULL CAPITALIZATION.**—Until the date on which the Fund is fully capitalized, amounts in the interest account of the Fund shall be invested in eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to publicly issued Treasury obligations that have maturities that coincide, to the maximum extent practicable, with the date on which the Fund is expected to be fully capitalized.

“(ii) **AFTER FULL CAPITALIZATION.**—On and after the date on which the Fund is fully capitalized, amounts in the interest account of the Fund shall be invested and reinvested in eligible obligations having the shortest maturity then available until the amounts are withdrawn and transferred to fund the activities authorized under subsection (d)(3).

“(E) **PAR PURCHASE PRICE.**—The price to be paid for eligible obligations purchased as investments of the principal account shall not exceed the par value of the obligations so that the amount of the principal account shall be preserved in perpetuity.

“(F) **HIGHEST YIELD.**—Among eligible obligations having the same maturity and purchase price, the obligation to be purchased shall be the obligation having the highest yield.

“(G) **HOLDING TO MATURITY.**—Eligible obligations purchased shall generally be held to their maturities.

“(3) **ANNUAL REVIEW OF INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES.**—Not less frequently than once each calendar year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall review with the State of South Dakota the results of the investment activities and financial status of the Fund during the preceding 12-month period.

“(4) **AUDITS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The activities of the State of South Dakota (referred to in this subsection as the ‘State’) in carrying out the plan of the State for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration under section 602(a) shall be audited as part of the annual audit that the State is required to prepare under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133 (or a successor circulation).

“(B) **DETERMINATION BY AUDITORS.**—An auditor that conducts an audit under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) determine whether funds received by the State under this section during the period covered by the audit were used to carry out the plan of the State in accordance with this section; and

“(ii) include the determination under clause (i) in the written findings of the audit.

“(5) **MODIFICATION OF INVESTMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines that meeting the requirements under paragraph (2) with respect to the investment of a Fund is not practicable, or would result in adverse consequences for the Fund, the Secretary shall modify the requirements, as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

“(B) **CONSULTATION.**—Before modifying a requirement under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with the State regarding the proposed modification.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(2) by inserting “of the Treasury” after “Secretary”; and

(3) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury to pay expenses associated with investing the Fund and auditing the uses of amounts withdrawn from the Fund—

“(1) \$500,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007; and

“(2) such sums as are necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.”.

(c) **INVESTMENT PROVISIONS FOR CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE AND LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE TRUST FUNDS.**—Section 604 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 389; 114 Stat. 2665) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) **INVESTMENTS.**—

“(1) **ELIGIBLE OBLIGATIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury shall invest the amounts deposited under subsection (b) and the interest earned on those amounts only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States issued directly to the Funds.

“(2) **INVESTMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest the amounts in each of the Funds in accordance with the requirements of this paragraph.

“(B) **SEPARATE INVESTMENTS OF PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST.**—

“(i) **PRINCIPAL ACCOUNT.**—The amounts deposited in each Fund under subsection (b) shall be credited to an account within the Fund (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘principal account’) and invested as provided in subparagraph (C).

“(ii) **INTEREST ACCOUNT.**—The interest earned from investing amounts in the principal account of each Fund shall be transferred to a separate account within the Fund (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘interest account’) and invested as provided in subparagraph (D).

“(iii) **CREDITING.**—The interest earned from investing amounts in the interest account of each Fund shall be credited to the interest account.

“(C) **INVESTMENT OF PRINCIPAL ACCOUNT.**—

“(i) **INITIAL INVESTMENT.**—Each amount deposited in the principal account of each Fund shall be invested initially in eligible obligations having the shortest maturity then available until the date on which the amount is divided into 3 substantially equal portions and those portions are invested in eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to the next-issued publicly issued Treasury obligations having a 2-year maturity, a 5-year maturity, and a 10-year maturity, respectively.

“(ii) **SUBSEQUENT INVESTMENT.**—As each 2-year, 5-year, and 10-year eligible obligation matures, the principal of the maturing eligible obligation shall also be invested initially in the shortest-maturity eligible obligation then available until the principal is reinvested substantially equally in the eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to the next-issued publicly issued Treasury obligations having 2-year, 5-year, and 10-year maturities.

“(iii) **DISCONTINUANCE OF ISSUANCE OF OBLIGATIONS.**—If the Department of the Treasury discontinues issuing to the public obligations having 2-year, 5-year, or 10-year maturities, the principal of any maturing eligible obligation shall be reinvested substantially equally in eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to the next-issued publicly issued Treasury obligations of the maturities longer than 1 year then available.

“(D) **INVESTMENT OF INTEREST ACCOUNT.**—

“(i) **BEFORE FULL CAPITALIZATION.**—Until the date on which each Fund is fully capitalized, amounts in the interest account of the Fund shall be invested in eligible obligations that are identical (except for transferability) to publicly issued Treasury obligations that have maturities that coincide, to the maximum extent practicable, with the date on which the Fund is expected to be fully capitalized.

“(ii) **AFTER FULL CAPITALIZATION.**—On and after the date on which each Fund is fully capitalized, amounts in the interest account of the Fund shall be invested and reinvested in eligible obligations having the shortest maturity then available until the amounts are withdrawn and transferred to fund the activities authorized under subsection (d)(3).

“(E) **PAR PURCHASE PRICE.**—The price to be paid for eligible obligations purchased as investments of the principal account shall not exceed the par value of the obligations so that the amount of the principal account shall be preserved in perpetuity.

“(F) **HIGHEST YIELD.**—Among eligible obligations having the same maturity and purchase price, the obligation to be purchased shall be the obligation having the highest yield.

“(G) **HOLDING TO MATURITY.**—Eligible obligations purchased shall generally be held to their maturities.

“(3) **ANNUAL REVIEW OF INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES.**—Not less frequently than once each calendar year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall review with the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Tribes’) the results of the investment activities and financial status of the Funds during the preceding 12-month period.

“(4) **AUDITS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The activities of the Tribes in carrying out the plans of the Tribes for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration under section 602(a) shall be audited as part of the annual audit that the Tribes are required to prepare under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133 (or a successor circulation).

“(B) **DETERMINATION BY AUDITORS.**—An auditor that conducts an audit under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) determine whether funds received by the Tribes under this section during the period covered by the audit were used to carry out the plan of the appropriate Tribe in accordance with this section; and

“(ii) include the determination under clause (i) in the written findings of the audit.

“(5) **MODIFICATION OF INVESTMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines that meeting the requirements under paragraph (2) with respect to the investment of a Fund is not practicable, or would result in adverse consequences for the Fund, the Secretary shall modify the requirements, as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

“(B) **CONSULTATION.**—Before modifying a requirement under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with the Tribes regarding the proposed modification.”;

(2) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury to pay expenses associated with investing the Funds and auditing the uses of amounts withdrawn from the Funds—

“(1) \$500,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007; and

“(2) such sums as are necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.”.

#### SEC. 5130. EAST TENNESSEE.

(a) **EAST TENNESSEE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “East Tennessee” means the counties of Blount, Knox, Loudon, McMinn, Monroe, and Sevier, Tennessee.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in East Tennessee.

(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in East Tennessee, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(d) **OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) **LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.**—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) **CREDIT FOR WORK.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) **CREDIT FOR INTEREST.**—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of the project cost.

(D) **CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project cost (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(g) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(h) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.**—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

(i) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

#### **SEC. 5131. FRITZ LANDING, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a study of the Fritz Landing Agricultural Spur Levee, Tennessee, to determine the extent of levee modifications that would be required to make the levee and associated drainage structures consistent with Federal standards;

(2) design and construct such modifications; and

(3) after completion of such modifications, incorporate the levee into the project for flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, authorized by the Act entitled “An Act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes”, approved May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534-539).

#### **SEC. 5132. J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall plan, design, and construct a trail system at the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir, Tennessee, authorized by section 4 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1217), and adjacent public property, including design and construction of support facilities. In carrying out such improvements, the Secretary is authorized to use funds made available by the State of Tennessee from any Federal or State source, or both.

#### **SEC. 5133. NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, recreation, navigation, and flood damage reduction components of the Nashville Riverfront Concept Plan, dated February 2007.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with appropriate representatives in the vicinity of Nashville, Tennessee, including the Nashville Parks and Recreation Department, the city of Nashville, and Davidson County.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### **SEC. 5134. NONCONNAH WEIR, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.**

The project for flood control, Nonconna Creek, Tennessee and Mississippi, authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124) and modified by the section 334 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2611), is modified to authorize the Secretary—

(1) to reconstruct, at Federal expense, the weir originally constructed in the vicinity of the mouth of Nonconna Creek; and

(2) to make repairs and maintain the weir in the future so that the weir functions properly.

#### **SEC. 5135. TENNESSEE RIVER PARTNERSHIP.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the operation and maintenance of the project for navigation, Tennessee River, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Kentucky, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 927), the Secretary may enter into a partnership with a nonprofit entity to remove debris from the Tennessee River in the vicinity of Knoxville, Tennessee, by providing a vessel to such entity, at Federal expense, for such debris removal purposes.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$500,000.

#### **SEC. 5136. TOWN CREEK, LENOIR CITY, TENNESSEE.**

The Secretary shall design and construct the project for flood damage reduction designated as Alternative 4 in the Town Creek, Lenoir City, Loudon County, Tennessee, feasibility report of the Nashville district engineer, dated November 2000, under the authority of section 205 of the

Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), notwithstanding section 1 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701a; 49 Stat. 1570). The non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be subject to section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

#### **SEC. 5137. UPPER MISSISSIPPI EMBAYMENT, TENNESSEE, ARKANSAS, AND MISSISSIPPI.**

The Secretary may participate with non-Federal and nonprofit entities to address issues concerning managing groundwater as a sustainable resource through the Upper Mississippi Embayment, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi, and to coordinate the protection of groundwater supply and groundwater quality of the Embayment with local surface water protection programs. There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out this section.

#### **SEC. 5138. TEXAS.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the State of Texas.

(b) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of planning, design, and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Texas, including projects for water supply, storage, treatment, and related facilities, water quality protection, wastewater treatment, and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection, and development, as identified by the Texas Water Development Board.

(c) **OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest.

(e) **COST SHARING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of the project under this section—

(A) shall be 75 percent; and

(B) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(2) **IN-KIND SERVICES.**—The non-Federal share may be provided in the form of materials and in-kind services, including planning, design, construction, and management services, as the Secretary determines to be compatible with, and necessary for, the project.

(3) **CREDIT FOR WORK.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(4) **CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs.

(5) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

#### **SEC. 5139. BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TEXAS.**

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**—The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local entities, shall develop, as expeditiously as practicable, a comprehensive plan for

development of new technologies and innovative approaches for restoring, preserving, and protecting the Bosque River watershed within Bosque, Hamilton, McLennan, and Erath Counties, Texas. The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, may carry out activities identified in the comprehensive plan to demonstrate practicable alternatives for stabilization and enhancement of land and water resources in the basin.

(b) **SERVICES OF NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER ENTITIES.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary may utilize, through contracts or other means, the services of nonprofit institutions and such other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(1) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(2) **DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of development of the plan under subsection (a) shall be 25 percent.

(3) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of operation and maintenance for measures constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000.

#### **SEC. 5140. DALLAS COUNTY REGION, TEXAS.**

(a) **DALLAS COUNTY REGION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Dallas County region” means the city of Dallas, and the municipalities of DeSoto, Duncanville, Lancaster, Wilmer, Hutchins, Balch Springs, Cedar Hill, Glenn Heights, and Ferris, Texas.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the Dallas County region.

(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in the Dallas County region, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(d) **OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) **LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.**—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) **CREDIT FOR WORK.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the

Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(C) **CREDIT FOR INTEREST.**—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share.

(D) **CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(E) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(g) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(b)), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(h) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.**—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

(i) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000.

#### **SEC. 5141. DALLAS FLOODWAY, DALLAS, TEXAS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for flood control, Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled, “An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 18), is modified to—

(1) direct the Secretary to review the Balanced Vision Plan for the Trinity River Corridor, Dallas, Texas, dated December 2003 and amended in March 2004, prepared by the non-Federal interest for the project;

(2) direct the Secretary to review the Interior Levee Drainage Study Phase-I report, Dallas, Texas, dated September 2006, prepared by the non-Federal interest; and

(3) if the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound and environmentally acceptable, authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$459,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$298,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$161,000,000.

(b) **CREDIT.**—

(1) **IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(2) **CASH CONTRIBUTIONS.**—The Secretary shall accept funds provided by the non-Federal interest for use in carrying out planning, engineering, and design for the project. The Federal share of such planning, engineering, and design carried out with non-Federal contributions shall be credited against the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

#### **SEC. 5142. HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS.**

Section 575(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3789; 113 Stat. 311) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding the following:

“(5) the project for flood control, Upper White Oak Bayou, Texas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4125).”.

#### **SEC. 5143. JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON, TEXAS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreation, Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas, authorized by section 101(b)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 280), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the report entitled “Johnson Creek: A Vision of Conservation”, dated March 30, 2006, at a total cost of \$80,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$52,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$28,000,000, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

(b) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project may be provided in cash or in the form of in-kind services or materials.

(2) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning, design, and construction work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In evaluating and implementing the project, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184).

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 134 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2263) is repealed.

#### **SEC. 5144. ONION CREEK, TEXAS.**

(a) **INCLUSION OF COSTS AND BENEFITS OF RELOCATION OF FLOOD-PRONE RESIDENCES.**—In carrying out the study for the project for flood damage reduction, recreation, and ecosystem restoration, Onion Creek, Texas, the Secretary shall include the costs and benefits associated with the relocation of flood-prone residences in the study area for the project in the period beginning 2 years before the date of initiation of the study and ending on the date of execution of the partnership agreement for construction of the project to the extent the Secretary determines such relocations are compatible with the project.

(b) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project referred to in subsection (a) the cost of relocation of those flood-prone residences described in subsection (a) that are incurred by the non-Federal interest before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

#### **SEC. 5145. CONNECTICUT RIVER DAMS, VERMONT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall evaluate, design, and carry out structural modifications at Federal cost to the Union Village Dam (Ompompanoosuc River), North Hartland Dam (Ottawquechee River), North Springfield Dam (Black River), Ball Mountain Dam (West River), and Townshend Dam (West River), Vermont, to regulate flow and temperature to mitigate downstream impacts on aquatic habitat and fisheries.

(b) **INCLUSION.**—During the evaluation and design portion of the modifications authorized by this section, the Secretary shall ensure that a sustainable flow analysis is conducted for each dam.



(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000.

**SEC. 5146. LAKE CHAMPLAIN CANAL, VERMONT AND NEW YORK.**

(a) **DISPERSAL BARRIER PROJECT.**—The Secretary shall determine, at Federal expense, the feasibility of a dispersal barrier project at the Lake Champlain Canal, Vermont and New York, to prevent the spread of aquatic nuisance species.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION.**—If the Secretary determines that the project described in subsection (a) is feasible, the Secretary shall construct, maintain, and operate a dispersal barrier at the Lake Champlain Canal at Federal expense.

**SEC. 5147. DYKE MARSH, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA.**

The Secretary shall accept funds from the National Park Service to restore Dyke Marsh, Fairfax County, Virginia.

**SEC. 5148. EASTERN SHORE AND SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA.**

Section 219(f)(10) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$20,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—\$20,000,000 for water supply, wastewater infrastructure, and environmental restoration”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.”; and

(3) by aligning the remainder of the text of subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) with subparagraph (B) (as added by paragraph (2) of this section).

**SEC. 5149. JAMES RIVER, VIRGINIA.**

The Secretary shall accept funds from the National Park Service to provide technical and project management assistance for the James River, Virginia, with a particular emphasis on locations along the shoreline adversely impacted by Hurricane Isabel.

**SEC. 5150. BAKER BAY AND ILWACO HARBOR, WASHINGTON.**

The Secretary shall conduct a study of increased siltation in Baker Bay and Ilwaco Harbor, Washington, to determine if the siltation is the result of a Federal navigation project (including diverted flows from the Columbia River) and, if the Secretary determines that the siltation is the result of a Federal navigation project, the Secretary shall carry out a project to mitigate the siltation as part of maintenance of the Federal navigation project.

**SEC. 5151. HAMILTON ISLAND CAMPGROUND, WASHINGTON.**

The Secretary is authorized to plan, design, and construct a campground for Bonneville Lock and Dam at Hamilton Island (also known as “Strawberry Island”) in Skamania County, Washington.

**SEC. 5152. EROSION CONTROL, PUGET ISLAND, WAHAKIUM COUNTY, WASHINGTON.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Lower Columbia River levees and bank protection works authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 178) is modified with regard to the Wahkiakum County diking districts No. 1 and 3, but without regard to any cost ceiling authorized before the date of enactment of this Act, to direct the Secretary to provide a one-time placement of dredged material along portions of the Columbia River shoreline of Puget Island, Washington, between river miles 38 to 47, and the shoreline of Westport Beach, Clatsop County, Oregon, between river miles 43 to 45, to protect economic and environmental resources in the area from further erosion.

(b) **COORDINATION AND COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall carry out subsection (a)—

(1) in coordination with appropriate resource agencies; and

(2) at Federal expense.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000.

**SEC. 5153. WILLAPA BAY, WASHINGTON.**

Section 545 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2675) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1) by striking “may construct” and inserting “shall construct”; and

(2) by inserting “and ecosystem restoration” after “erosion protection” each place it appears.

**SEC. 5154. WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL.**

(a) **CHEAT AND TYGART RIVER BASINS, WEST VIRGINIA.**—Section 581(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790; 113 Stat. 313) is amended—

(1) by striking “flood control measures” and inserting “structural and nonstructural flood control, streambank protection, stormwater management, and channel clearing and modification measures”; and

(2) by inserting “with respect to measures that incorporate levees or floodwalls” before the semicolon.

(b) **PRIORITY COMMUNITIES.**—Section 581(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3791) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) Etna, Pennsylvania, in the Pine Creek watershed; and

“(8) Millvale, Pennsylvania, in the Girty’s Run River basin.”.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 581(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3791) is amended by striking “\$12,000,000” and inserting “\$90,000,000”.

**SEC. 5155. CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA.**

Section 571 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 371) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Nicholas,”; and

(B) by striking “Gilmer,”;

(2) in subsection (h) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project undertaken under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

“(j) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.**—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.”.

**SEC. 5156. SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.**

(a) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS.**—Section 340 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856; 113 Stat. 320) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS.**—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.”.

(b) **SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA DEFINED.**—Section 340(f) of such Act is amended by inserting “Nicholas,” after “Greenbrier,”.

(c) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—Section 340 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **NONPROFIT ENTITIES.**—In accordance with section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project car-

ried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.”.

**SEC. 5157. CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.**

Section 211(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b–13) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) **PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.**—The project for flood control, Perris, California.

“(13) **THORNTON RESERVOIR, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.**—An element of the project for flood control, Chicagoland Underflow Plan, Illinois.

“(14) **LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LOUISIANA.**—The project for flood control, Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana.

“(15) **BUFFALO BAYOU, TEXAS.**—A project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou, Texas, to provide an alternative to the project authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 804) and modified by section 3a of the Flood Control Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1414).

“(16) **HALLS BAYOU, TEXAS.**—A project for flood control, Halls Bayou, Texas, to provide an alternative to the project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610).

“(17) **MEMONONEE RIVER WATERSHED, WISCONSIN.**—The project for the Menomonee River Watershed, Wisconsin, including—

“(A) the Underwood Creek diversion facility project (Milwaukee County Grounds); and

“(B) the Greater Milwaukee Rivers watershed project.”.

**SEC. 5158. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL PROJECTS.**

Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334; 113 Stat. 1494; 114 Stat. 2763A–219; 119 Stat. 2255) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(5) by striking “a project for the elimination or control of combined sewer overflows” and inserting “projects for the design, installation, enhancement, or repair of sewer systems”;

(2) in subsection (e)(1) by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$32,500,000”; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking the undesignated paragraph relating to Charleston, South Carolina, and inserting the following:

“(72) **CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—\$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including wastewater collection systems, and stormwater system improvements, Charleston, South Carolina.”.

(B) by redesignating the paragraph (71) relating to Placer and El Dorado Counties, California, as paragraph (73);

(C) by redesignating the paragraph (72) relating to Lassen, Plumas, Butte, Sierra, and Nevada Counties, California, as paragraph (74);

(D) by striking the paragraph (71) relating to Indianapolis, Indiana, and inserting the following:

“(75) **INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.**—\$6,430,000 for environmental infrastructure for Indianapolis, Indiana.”.

(E) by redesignating the paragraph (73) relating to St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin, as paragraph (76);

(F) by redesignating paragraph (72), relating to Alpine, California, as paragraph (77); and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(78) **ST. CLAIR COUNTY, ALABAMA.**—\$5,000,000 for water related infrastructure, St. Clair County, Alabama.

“(79) **CRAWFORD COUNTY, ARKANSAS.**—\$35,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, Crawford County, Arkansas.

“(80) **ALAMEDA AND CONTRA COSTA COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA.**—\$25,000,000 for recycled water treatment facilities within the East Bay Municipal Utility District service area, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, California.



“(81) ALISO CREEK, ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$5,000,000 for water related infrastructure, Aliso Creek, Orange County, California.

“(82) AMADOR COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$3,000,000 for wastewater collection and treatment infrastructure, Amador County, California.

“(83) ARCADIA, SIERRA MADRE, AND UPLAND, CALIFORNIA.—\$33,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Arcadia, Sierra Madre, and Upland, California, including \$13,000,000 for stormwater infrastructure for Upland, California.

“(84) BIG BEAR AREA REGIONAL WASTEWATER AGENCY, CALIFORNIA.—\$15,000,000 for water reclamation and distribution infrastructure, Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency, California.

“(85) BRAWLEY COLONIA, IMPERIAL COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$1,400,000 for water infrastructure to improve water quality in the Brawley Colonia Water District, Imperial County, California.

“(86) CALAVERAS COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$3,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure improvement projects in Calaveras County, California, including wastewater reclamation, recycling, and conjunctive use projects.

“(87) CONTRA COSTA WATER DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA.—\$23,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure for the Contra Costa Water District, California.

“(88) EAST BAY, SAN FRANCISCO, AND SANTA CLARA AREAS, CALIFORNIA.—\$4,000,000 for a desalination project to serve the East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara areas, California.

“(89) EAST PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA.—\$4,000,000 for a new pump station and stormwater management and drainage system, East Palo Alto, California.

“(90) IMPERIAL COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including a wastewater disinfection facility and polishing system, to improve water quality in the vicinity of Calexico, California, on the southern New River, Imperial County, California.

“(91) LA HABRA, CALIFORNIA.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater and water related infrastructure, city of La Habra, California.

“(92) LA MIRADA, CALIFORNIA.—\$4,000,000 for the planning, design, and construction of a stormwater program in La Mirada, California.

“(93) LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$3,000,000 for wastewater and water related infrastructure, Diamond Bar, La Habra Heights, and Rowland Heights, Los Angeles County, California.

“(94) LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$20,000,000 for the planning, design, and construction of water related infrastructure for Santa Monica Bay and the coastal zone of Los Angeles County, California.

“(95) MALIBU, CALIFORNIA.—\$3,000,000 for municipal wastewater and recycled water infrastructure, Malibu Creek Watershed Protection Project, Malibu, California.

“(96) MONTEBELLO, CALIFORNIA.—\$4,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements in south Montebello, California.

“(97) NEW RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—\$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure to improve water quality in the New River, California.

“(98) ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$10,000,000 for wastewater and water related infrastructure, Anaheim, Brea, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, and Yorba Linda, Orange County, California.

“(99) PORT OF STOCKTON, STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA.—\$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure projects for Rough and Ready Island and vicinity, Stockton, California.

“(100) PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.—\$3,000,000 for recycled water transmission infrastructure, Eastern Municipal Water District, Perris, California.

“(101) SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$9,000,000 for wastewater and water related infrastructure, Chino and Chino Hills, San Bernardino County, California.

“(102) SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$5,500,000 for an advanced recycling water treatment plant in Santa Clara County, California.

“(103) SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA.—\$3,000,000 for improving water system reliability, Santa Monica, California.

“(104) SOUTHERN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$15,000,000 for environmental infrastructure for the groundwater basin optimization pipeline, Southern Los Angeles County, California.

“(105) STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA.—\$33,000,000 for water treatment and distribution infrastructure, Stockton, California.

“(106) SWEETWATER RESERVOIR, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—\$375,000 to improve water quality and remove nonnative aquatic nuisance species from the Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, California.

“(107) WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA.—\$8,000,000 for water, wastewater, and water related infrastructure, Whittier, California.

“(108) ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT, COLORADO.—\$10,000,000 for the Arkansas Valley Conduit, Colorado.

“(109) BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO.—\$10,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, Boulder County, Colorado.

“(110) MONTEZUMA AND LA PLATA COUNTIES, COLORADO.—\$1,000,000 for water and wastewater related infrastructure for the Ute Mountain project, Montezuma and La Plata Counties, Colorado.

“(111) OTERO, BENT, CROWLEY, KIOWA, AND PROWERS COUNTIES, COLORADO.—\$35,000,000 for water transmission infrastructure, Otero, Bent, Crowley, Kiowa, and Prowers Counties, Colorado.

“(112) PUEBLO AND OTERO COUNTIES, COLORADO.—\$34,000,000 for water transmission infrastructure, Pueblo and Otero Counties, Colorado.

“(113) ENFIELD, CONNECTICUT.—\$1,000,000 for infiltration and inflow correction, Enfield, Connecticut.

“(114) LEDYARD AND MONTVILLE, CONNECTICUT.—\$7,113,000 for water infrastructure, Ledyard and Montville, Connecticut.

“(115) NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.—\$300,000 for stormwater system improvements, New Haven, Connecticut.

“(116) NORWALK, CONNECTICUT.—\$3,000,000 for the Keeler Brook Storm Water Improvement Project, Norwalk, Connecticut.

“(117) PLAINVILLE, CONNECTICUT.—\$6,280,000 for wastewater treatment, Plainville, Connecticut.

“(118) SOUTHTON, CONNECTICUT.—\$9,420,000 for water supply infrastructure, Southington, Connecticut.

“(119) ANACOSTIA RIVER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND.—\$20,000,000 for environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development to enhance water quality and living resources in the Anacostia River watershed, District of Columbia and Maryland.

“(120) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—\$35,000,000 for implementation of a combined sewer overflow long-term control plan in the District of Columbia.

“(121) CHARLOTTE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—\$3,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, Charlotte County, Florida.

“(122) CHARLOTTE, LEE, AND COLLIER COUNTIES, FLORIDA.—\$20,000,000 for water supply interconnectivity infrastructure, Charlotte, Lee, and Collier Counties, Florida.

“(123) COLLIER COUNTY, FLORIDA.—\$5,000,000 for water infrastructure to improve water quality in the vicinity of the Gordon River, Collier County, Florida.

“(124) HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA.—\$6,250,000 for water infrastructure and supply enhancement, Hillsborough County, Florida.

“(125) JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA.—\$25,000,000 for wastewater related infrastructure, including septic tank replacements, Jacksonville, Florida.

“(126) SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA.—\$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Sarasota County, Florida.

“(127) SOUTH SEMINOLE AND NORTH ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—\$30,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure for the South Seminole and North Orange Wastewater Transmission Authority, Florida.

“(128) MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—\$6,250,000 for water reuse supply and a water transmission pipeline, Miami-Dade County, Florida.

“(129) PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.—\$7,500,000 for water infrastructure, Palm Beach County, Florida.

“(130) ALBANY, GEORGIA.—\$4,000,000 for a storm drainage system, Albany, Georgia.

“(131) BANKS COUNTY, GEORGIA.—\$5,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements, Banks County, Georgia.

“(132) BERRIEN COUNTY, GEORGIA.—\$5,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements, Berrien County, Georgia.

“(133) CHATTOOGA COUNTY, GEORGIA.—\$8,000,000 for wastewater and drinking water infrastructure improvement, Chattooga County, Georgia.

“(134) CHATTOOGA, FLOYD, GORDON, WALKER, AND WHITFIELD COUNTIES, GEORGIA.—\$10,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements, Armuchee Valley, Chattooga, Floyd, Gordon, Walker, and Whitfield Counties, Georgia.

“(135) DAHLONEGA, GEORGIA.—\$5,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements, Dahlonega, Georgia.

“(136) EAST POINT, GEORGIA.—\$5,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements, city of East Point, Georgia.

“(137) FAYETTEVILLE, GRANTVILLE, LAGRANGE, PINE MOUNTAIN (HARRIS COUNTY), DOUGLASVILLE, AND CARROLLTON, GEORGIA.—\$24,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Fayetteville, Grantville, LaGrange, Pine Mountain (Harris County), Douglasville, and Carrollton, Georgia.

“(138) MERIWETHER AND SPALDING COUNTIES, GEORGIA.—\$7,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Meriwether and Spalding Counties, Georgia.

“(139) MOULTRIE, GEORGIA.—\$5,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, Moultrie, Georgia.

“(140) STEPHENS COUNTY/CITY OF TOCCOA, GEORGIA.—\$8,000,000 water infrastructure improvements, Stephens County/city of Toccoa, Georgia.

“(141) NORTH VERNON AND BUTLERVILLE, INDIANA.—\$1,700,000 for wastewater infrastructure, North Vernon and Butlerville, Indiana.

“(142) SALEM, WASHINGTON COUNTY, INDIANA.—\$3,200,000 for water supply infrastructure, Salem, Washington County, Indiana.

“(143) ATCHISON, KANSAS.—\$20,000,000 to address combined sewer overflows, Atchison, Kansas.

“(144) CENTRAL KENTUCKY.—\$10,000,000 for water related infrastructure and resource protection and development, Scott, Franklin, Woodford, Anderson, Fayette, Mercer, Jessamine, Boyle, Lincoln, Garrard, Madison, Estill, Powell, Clark, Montgomery, and Bourbon Counties, Kentucky.

“(145) LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA.—\$1,200,000 for water and wastewater improvements, Lafayette, Louisiana.

“(146) LAFOURCHE PARISH, LOUISIANA.—\$2,300,000 for measures to prevent the intrusion of saltwater into the freshwater system, Lafourche Parish, Louisiana.

“(147) LAKE CHARLES, LOUISIANA.—\$1,000,000 for water and wastewater improvements, Lake Charles, Louisiana.

“(148) NORTHWEST LOUISIANA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS, LOUISIANA.—\$2,000,000 for water and wastewater improvements, Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments, Louisiana.

“(149) OUACHITA PARISH, LOUISIANA.—\$1,000,000 for water and wastewater improvements, Ouachita Parish, Louisiana.

“(150) PLAQUEMINE, LOUISIANA.—\$7,000,000 for sanitary sewer and wastewater infrastructure, Plaquemine, Louisiana.

“(151) RAPIDES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION, LOUISIANA.—\$1,000,000 for water and wastewater improvements, Rapides, Louisiana.

“(152) SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA.—\$20,000,000 for water supply infrastructure in Shreveport, Louisiana.

“(153) SOUTH CENTRAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, LOUISIANA.—\$2,500,000 for water and wastewater improvements, South Central Planning and Development Commission, Louisiana.

“(154) UNION-LINCOLN REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT, LOUISIANA.—\$2,000,000 for the Union-Lincoln Regional Water Supply project, Louisiana.

“(155) CHESAPEAKE BAY IMPROVEMENTS, MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—\$30,000,000 for environmental infrastructure projects to benefit the Chesapeake Bay, including the nutrient removal project at the Blue Plains Wastewater Treatment facility in the District of Columbia.

“(156) CHESAPEAKE BAY REGION, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.—\$40,000,000 for water pollution control, Chesapeake Bay Region, Maryland and Virginia.

“(157) MICHIGAN COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS.—\$35,000,000 for correction of combined sewer overflows, Michigan.

“(158) CENTRAL IRON RANGE SANITARY SEWER DISTRICT, MINNESOTA.—\$12,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure for the Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District to serve the cities of Hibbing, Chisholm, Buhl, and Kinney, and Balkan and Great Scott Townships, Minnesota.

“(159) CENTRAL LAKE REGION SANITARY DISTRICT, MINNESOTA.—\$2,000,000 for sanitary sewer and wastewater infrastructure for the Central Lake Region Sanitary District, Minnesota, to serve Le Grande and Moe Townships, Minnesota.

“(160) GOODVIEW, MINNESOTA.—\$3,000,000 for water quality infrastructure, Goodview, Minnesota.

“(161) GRAND RAPIDS, MINNESOTA.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

“(162) WILLMAR, MINNESOTA.—\$15,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Willmar, Minnesota.

“(163) BILOXI, MISSISSIPPI.—\$5,000,000 for water and wastewater related infrastructure, city of Biloxi, Mississippi.

“(164) CORINTH, MISSISSIPPI.—\$7,500,000 for a surface water program, city of Corinth, Mississippi.

“(165) GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI.—\$5,000,000 for water and wastewater related infrastructure, city of Gulfport, Mississippi.

“(166) HARRISON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—\$5,000,000 for water and wastewater related infrastructure, Harrison County, Mississippi.

“(167) JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI.—\$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Jackson, Mississippi.

“(168) CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—\$30,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Clark County, Nevada.

“(169) CLEAN WATER COALITION, NEVADA.—\$50,000,000 for the Systems Conveyance and Operations Program, Clark County, Henderson, Las Vegas, and North Las Vegas, Nevada.

“(170) GLENDALE DAM DIVERSION STRUCTURE, NEVADA.—\$10,000,000 for water system improvements to the Glendale Dam Diversion Structure for the Truckee Meadows Water Authority, Nevada.

“(171) HENDERSON, NEVADA.—\$13,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Henderson, Nevada.

“(172) INDIAN SPRINGS, NEVADA.—\$12,000,000 for construction of wastewater system improvements for the Indian Springs community, Nevada.

“(173) RENO, NEVADA.—\$13,000,000 for construction of a water conservation project for the Highland Canal, Mogul Bypass in Reno, Nevada.

“(174) WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA.—\$14,000,000 for construction of water infrastructure im-

provements to the Huffaker Hills Reservoir Conservation Project, Washoe County, Nevada.

“(175) CRANFORD TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY.—\$6,000,000 for storm sewer improvements, Cranford Township, New Jersey.

“(176) MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY.—\$1,100,000 for storm sewer improvements, Middletown Township, New Jersey.

“(177) PATERSON, NEW JERSEY.—\$35,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Paterson, New Jersey.

“(178) RAHWAY VALLEY, NEW JERSEY.—\$25,000,000 for sanitary sewer and storm sewer improvements in the service area of the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority, New Jersey.

“(179) BABYLON, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Town of Babylon, New York.

“(180) ELLICOTTVILLE, NEW YORK.—\$2,000,000 for water supply, water, and wastewater infrastructure in Ellicottville, New York.

“(181) ELMIRA, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Elmira, New York.

“(182) ESSEX HAMLET, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Essex Hamlet, New York.

“(183) FLEMING, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure, Fleming, New York.

“(184) KIRYAS JOEL, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure, village of Kiryas Joel, New York.

“(185) NIAGARA FALLS, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Niagara Falls Water Board, New York.

“(186) PATCHOGUE, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, village of Patchogue, New York.

“(187) SENNETT, NEW YORK.—\$1,500,000 for water infrastructure, town of Sennett, New York.

“(188) SPRINGPORT AND FLEMING, NEW YORK.—\$10,000,000 for water related infrastructure, including water mains, pump stations, and water storage tanks, Springport and Fleming, New York.

“(189) WELLSVILLE, NEW YORK.—\$2,000,000 for water supply, water, and wastewater infrastructure in Wellsville, New York.

“(190) YATES COUNTY, NEW YORK.—\$5,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure, Yates County, New York.

“(191) CABARRUS COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$4,500,000 for water related infrastructure, Cabarrus County, North Carolina.

“(192) CARY, WAKE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$4,000,000 for a water reclamation facility, Cary, Wake County, North Carolina.

“(193) CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$14,000,000 for the Briar Creek Relief Sewer project, city of Charlotte, North Carolina.

“(194) FAYETTEVILLE, CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$6,000,000 for water and sewer upgrades, city of Fayetteville, Cumberland County, North Carolina.

“(195) MOORESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$4,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements, town of Mooresville, North Carolina.

“(196) NEUSE REGIONAL WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$4,000,000 for the Neuse regional drinking water facility, Kinston, North Carolina.

“(197) RICHMOND COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$13,500,000 for water related infrastructure, Richmond County, North Carolina.

“(198) UNION COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$6,000,000 for water related infrastructure, Union County, North Carolina.

“(199) WASHINGTON COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Washington County, North Carolina.

“(200) WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA.—\$3,000,000 for stormwater upgrades, city of Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

“(201) NORTH DAKOTA.—\$15,000,000 for water-related infrastructure, North Dakota.

“(202) DEVILS LAKE, NORTH DAKOTA.—\$15,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, Devils Lake, North Dakota.

“(203) SAIPAN, NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—\$20,000,000 for water related infrastructure, Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands.

“(204) AKRON, OHIO.—\$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Akron, Ohio

“(205) BURR OAK REGIONAL WATER DISTRICT, OHIO.—\$4,000,000 for construction of a water line to extend from a well field near Chauncey, Ohio, to a water treatment plant near Millfield, Ohio.

“(206) CINCINNATI, OHIO.—\$1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Cincinnati, Ohio.

“(207) CLEVELAND, OHIO.—\$2,500,000 for Flats East Bank water and wastewater infrastructure, city of Cleveland, Ohio.

“(208) COLUMBUS, OHIO.—\$4,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Columbus, Ohio.

“(209) DAYTON, OHIO.—\$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Dayton, Ohio.

“(210) DEFIANCE COUNTY, OHIO.—\$1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Defiance County, Ohio.

“(211) FOSTORIA, OHIO.—\$2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Fostoria, Ohio.

“(212) FREMONT, OHIO.—\$2,000,000 for construction of off-stream water supply reservoir, Fremont, Ohio.

“(213) LAKE COUNTY, OHIO.—\$1,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Lake County, Ohio.

“(214) LAWRENCE COUNTY, OHIO.—\$5,000,000 for Union Rome wastewater infrastructure, Lawrence County, Ohio.

“(215) MEIGS COUNTY, OHIO.—\$1,000,000 to extend the Tupper Plains Regional Water District water line to Meigs County, Ohio.

“(216) MENTOR-ON-LAKE, OHIO.—\$625,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Mentor-on-Lake, Ohio.

“(217) VINTON COUNTY, OHIO.—\$1,000,000 to construct water lines in Vinton and Brown Townships, Ohio.

“(218) WILLOWICK, OHIO.—\$665,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Willowick, Ohio.

“(219) ADA, OKLAHOMA.—\$1,700,000 for sewer improvements and other water infrastructure, city of Ada, Oklahoma.

“(220) ALVA, OKLAHOMA.—\$250,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements, city of Alva, Oklahoma.

“(221) ARDMORE, OKLAHOMA.—\$1,900,000 for water and sewer infrastructure improvements, city of Ardmore, Oklahoma.

“(222) BARTLESVILLE, OKLAHOMA.—\$2,500,000 for water supply infrastructure, city of Bartlesville, Oklahoma.

“(223) BETHANY, OKLAHOMA.—\$1,500,000 for water improvements and water related infrastructure, city of Bethany, Oklahoma.

“(224) CHICKASHA, OKLAHOMA.—\$650,000 for industrial park sewer infrastructure, city of Chickasha, Oklahoma.

“(225) DISNEY AND LANGLEY, OKLAHOMA.—\$2,500,000 for water and sewer improvements and water related infrastructure, cities of Disney and Langley, Oklahoma.

“(226) DURANT, OKLAHOMA.—\$3,300,000 for bayou restoration and water related infrastructure, city of Durant, Oklahoma.

“(227) EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY, WILBERTON, OKLAHOMA.—\$1,000,000 for sewer and utility upgrades and water related infrastructure, Eastern Oklahoma State University, Wilberton, Oklahoma.

“(228) GUYMON, OKLAHOMA.—\$16,000,000 for water and wastewater related infrastructure, city of Guymon, Oklahoma.

“(229) KONAWA, OKLAHOMA.—\$500,000 for water treatment infrastructure improvements, city of Konawa, Oklahoma.

“(230) LUGERT-ALTUS IRRIGATION DISTRICT, ALTUS, OKLAHOMA.—\$5,000,000 for water related infrastructure improvements, Lugert-Altus Irrigation District, Altus, Oklahoma.

“(231) MIDWEST CITY, OKLAHOMA.—\$2,000,000 for improvements to water related infrastructure, the City of Midwest City, Oklahoma.

“(232) **MUSTANG, OKLAHOMA.**—\$3,325,000 for water improvements and water related infrastructure, city of Mustang, Oklahoma.

“(233) **NORMAN, OKLAHOMA.**—\$10,000,000 for water related infrastructure, Norman, Oklahoma.

“(234) **OKLAHOMA PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY, GUYMON, OKLAHOMA.**—\$275,000 for water testing facility and water related infrastructure development, Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Guymon, Oklahoma.

“(235) **WEATHERFORD, OKLAHOMA.**—\$500,000 for arsenic program and water related infrastructure, city of Weatherford, Oklahoma.

“(236) **WOODWARD, OKLAHOMA.**—\$1,500,000 for water improvements and water related infrastructure, Woodward, Oklahoma.

“(237) **ALBANY, OREGON.**—\$35,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure to improve habitat restoration, Albany, Oregon.

“(238) **BEAVER CREEK RESERVOIR, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$3,000,000 for projects for water supply and related activities, Beaver Creek Reservoir, Clarion County, Beaver and Salem Townships, Pennsylvania.

“(239) **HATFIELD BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$310,000 for wastewater related infrastructure for Hatfield Borough, Pennsylvania.

“(240) **LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$5,000,000 for stormwater control measures and storm sewer improvements, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania.

“(241) **NORTH WALES BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$1,516,584 for wastewater related infrastructure for North Wales Borough, Pennsylvania.

“(242) **PEN ARGYL, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$5,250,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Pen Argyl, Pennsylvania.

“(243) **PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$1,600,000 for wastewater related infrastructure for Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

“(244) **STOCKERTON BOROUGH, TATAMY BOROUGH, AND PALMER TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$10,000,000 for stormwater control measures, particularly to address sinkholes, in the vicinity of Stockerton Borough, Tatamy Borough, and Palmer Township, Pennsylvania.

“(245) **VERA CRUZ, PENNSYLVANIA.**—\$5,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Vera Cruz, Pennsylvania.

“(246) **COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO.**—\$35,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

“(247) **CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—\$4,000,000 for stormwater control measures and storm sewer improvements, Spring Street/Fishburne Street drainage project, Charleston, South Carolina.

“(248) **CHARLESTON AND WEST ASHLEY, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—\$6,000,000 for wastewater tunnel replacement, Charleston and West Ashley, South Carolina.

“(249) **CROOKED CREEK, MARLBORO COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—\$25,000,000 for a project for water storage and water supply infrastructure on Crooked Creek, Marlboro County, South Carolina.

“(250) **MYRTLE BEACH, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—\$18,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including ocean outfalls, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina.

“(251) **NORTH MYRTLE BEACH, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—\$11,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including ocean outfalls, North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina.

“(252) **SURFSIDE, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—\$11,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including stormwater system improvements and ocean outfalls, Surfside, South Carolina.

“(253) **CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX RESERVATION (DEWEY AND ZIEBACH COUNTIES) AND PERKINS AND MEADE COUNTIES, SOUTH DAKOTA.**—\$65,000,000 for water related infrastructure, Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation (Dewey and Ziebach counties) and Perkins and Meade Counties, South Dakota.

“(254) **ATHENS, TENNESSEE.**—\$16,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Athens, Tennessee.

“(255) **BLAINE, TENNESSEE.**—\$500,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Blaine, Tennessee.

“(256) **CLAIBORNE COUNTY, TENNESSEE.**—\$1,250,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Claiborne County, Tennessee.

“(257) **GILES COUNTY, TENNESSEE.**—\$2,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, county of Giles, Tennessee.

“(258) **GRAINGER COUNTY, TENNESSEE.**—\$1,250,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Grainger County, Tennessee.

“(259) **HAMILTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE.**—\$500,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Hamilton County, Tennessee.

“(260) **HARROGATE, TENNESSEE.**—\$2,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, city of Harrogate, Tennessee.

“(261) **JOHNSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE.**—\$600,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Johnson County, Tennessee.

“(262) **KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE.**—\$5,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, city of Knoxville, Tennessee.

“(263) **NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.**—\$5,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Nashville, Tennessee.

“(264) **LEWIS, LAWRENCE, AND WAYNE COUNTIES, TENNESSEE.**—\$2,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, counties of Lewis, Lawrence, and Wayne, Tennessee.

“(265) **OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE.**—\$4,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, city of Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

“(266) **PLATEAU UTILITY DISTRICT, MORGAN COUNTY, TENNESSEE.**—\$1,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Morgan County, Tennessee.

“(267) **SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE.**—\$4,000,000 for water related environmental infrastructure, county of Shelby, Tennessee.

“(268) **CENTRAL TEXAS.**—\$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Bosque, Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Hill, Hood, Johnson, Madison, McLennan, Limestone, Robertson, and Somervell Counties, Texas.

“(269) **EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS.**—\$25,000,000 for water related infrastructure and resource protection, including stormwater management, and development, El Paso County, Texas.

“(270) **FT. BEND COUNTY, TEXAS.**—\$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Ft. Bend County, Texas.

“(271) **DUCHESNE, IRON, AND Uintah COUNTIES, UTAH.**—\$10,800,000 for water related infrastructure, Duchesne, Iron, and Uintah Counties, Utah.

“(272) **NORTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.**—\$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Hancock, Ohio, Marshall, Wetzel, Tyler, Pleasants, Wood, Doddridge, Monongalia, Marion, Harrison, Taylor, Barbour, Preston, Tucker, Mineral, Grant, Gilmer, Brooke, and Ritchie Counties, West Virginia.

“(273) **UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.**—\$25,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure for the St. Croix Anguilla wastewater treatment plant and the St. Thomas Charlotte Amalie wastewater treatment plant, United States Virgin Islands.”

#### TITLE VI—FLORIDA EVERGLADES

##### SEC. 6001. **HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER, FLORIDA.**

(a) **MODIFICATION.**—The project for Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida, authorized by section 101(a)(16) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 276), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project at a total cost of \$42,500,000.

(b) **TREATMENT.**—Section 601(b)(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2681) is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by adding at the end the following: “The project for aquifer storage and recovery, Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida, authorized by section 101(a)(16) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113

Stat. 276), shall be treated for purposes of this section as being in the Plan, except that operation and maintenance costs of the project shall remain a non-Federal responsibility.”; and

(2) in clause (iii) by inserting after “subparagraph (B)” the following: “and the project for aquifer storage and recovery, Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer”.

##### SEC. 6002. **PILOT PROJECTS.**

Section 601(b)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2681) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) by striking “\$69,000,000” and inserting “\$71,200,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$34,500,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$35,600,000”; and

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “\$6,000,000” and inserting “\$8,200,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$3,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$4,100,000”.

##### SEC. 6003. **MAXIMUM COSTS.**

(a) **MAXIMUM COST OF PROJECTS.**—Section 601(b)(2)(E) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2683) is amended by inserting “and section (d)” before the period at the end.

(b) **MAXIMUM COST OF PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—Section 601(c)(3) of such Act (114 Stat. 2684) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **MAXIMUM COST OF PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—Section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) shall apply to the individual project funding limits in subparagraph (A) and the aggregate cost limits in subparagraph (B).”.

##### SEC. 6004. **CREDIT.**

Section 601(e)(5)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2685) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “or” at the end of subclause (I);

(B) by adding “or” at the end of subclause (II); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) the credit is provided for work carried out before the date of the partnership agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor, as defined in an agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor providing for such credit.”; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking “design agreement or the project cooperation”; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, including in the case of credit provided under clause (i)(III) conditions relating to design and construction”.

##### SEC. 6005. **OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE.**

Section 601(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2691) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **MAXIMUM EXPENDITURES.**—The Secretary may expend up to \$3,000,000 per fiscal year for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004, to carry out this subsection.”.

##### SEC. 6006. **CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.**

Section 528(b)(3)(C) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3769) is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by striking “\$75,000,000” and all that follows and inserting “\$95,000,000”; and

(2) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subclause (II), the Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed \$25,000,000.

“(II) **SEMINOLE WATER CONSERVATION PLAN.**—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out the Seminole water conservation plan shall not exceed \$30,000,000.”.

**SEC. 6007. REGIONAL ENGINEERING MODEL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall complete the development and testing of the regional engineering model for environmental restoration as expeditiously as practicable.

(b) *USAGE.*—The Secretary shall consider using, as appropriate, the regional engineering model for environmental restoration in the development of future water resource projects, including projects developed pursuant to section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680).

**TITLE VII—LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA****SEC. 7001. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) *COASTAL LOUISIANA ECOSYSTEM.*—The term “coastal Louisiana ecosystem” means the coastal area of Louisiana from the Sabine River on the west to the Pearl River on the east, including those parts of the Atchafalaya River Basin and the Mississippi River Deltaic Plain below the Old River Control Structure and the Chenier Plain included within the study area of the restoration plan.

(2) *GOVERNOR.*—The term “Governor” means the Governor of the State of Louisiana.

(3) *RESTORATION PLAN.*—The term “restoration plan” means the report of the Chief of Engineers for ecosystem restoration for the Louisiana Coastal Area dated January 31, 2005.

(4) *TASK FORCE.*—The term “Task Force” means the Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force established by section 7003.

(5) *COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.*—The term “comprehensive plan” means the plan developed under section 7002 and any revisions thereto.

**SEC. 7002. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary, in coordination with the Governor, shall develop a comprehensive plan for protecting, preserving, and restoring the coastal Louisiana ecosystem.

(b) *INTEGRATION OF PLAN INTO COMPREHENSIVE HURRICANE PROTECTION STUDY.*—In developing the comprehensive plan, the Secretary shall integrate the restoration plan into the analysis and design of the comprehensive hurricane protection study authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2247).

(c) *CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE COASTAL PROTECTION MASTER PLAN.*—In developing the comprehensive plan, the Secretary shall ensure that the plan is not inconsistent with the goals, analysis, and design of the comprehensive coastal protection master plan authorized and defined pursuant to Act 8 of the First Extraordinary Session of the Louisiana State Legislature, 2005.

(d) *INCLUSIONS.*—The comprehensive plan shall include a description of—

(1) the framework of a long-term program integrated with hurricane and storm damage reduction, flood damage reduction, and navigation activities that provide for the comprehensive protection, conservation, and restoration of the wetlands, estuaries, barrier islands, shorelines, and related land and features of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem, including protection of critical resources, habitat, and infrastructure from the effects of a coastal storm, a hurricane, erosion, or subsidence;

(2) the means by which a new technology, or an improved technique, can be integrated into the program referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) the role of other Federal and State agencies and programs in carrying out such program;

(4) specific, measurable success criteria (including ecological criteria) by which success of the plan will be measured;

(5) proposed projects in order of priority as determined by their respective potential to contribute to—

(A) creation of coastal wetlands; and

(B) flood protection of communities ranked by population density and level of protection; and

(6) efforts by Federal, State, and local interests to address sociological, economic, and related fields of law.

(e) *CONSIDERATIONS.*—In developing the comprehensive plan, the Secretary shall consider the advisability of integrating into the program referred to in subsection (d)(1)—

(1) an investigation and study of the maximum effective use of the water and sediment of the Mississippi and Atchafalaya Rivers for coastal restoration purposes consistent with flood control and navigation;

(2) a schedule for the design and implementation of large-scale water and sediment reintroduction projects and an assessment of funding needs from any source;

(3) an investigation and assessment of alterations in the operation of the Old River Control Structure, consistent with flood control and navigation purposes;

(4) any related Federal or State project being carried out on the date on which the plan is developed;

(5) any activity in the restoration plan; and

(6) any other project or activity identified in one or more of—

(A) the Mississippi River and Tributaries program;

(B) the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation Plan;

(C) the Louisiana Coastal Zone Management Plan;

(D) the plan of the State of Louisiana entitled “Integrated Ecosystem Restoration and Hurricane Protection—Louisiana’s Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast”; and

(E) other relevant reports as determined by the Secretary.

(f) *REPORTS TO CONGRESS.*—

(1) *INITIAL REPORT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the comprehensive plan.

(2) *UPDATES.*—Not later than 5 years after the date of submission of a report under paragraph (1), and at least once every 5 years thereafter until implementation of the comprehensive plan is complete, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing an update of the plan and an assessment of the progress made in implementing the plan.

**SEC. 7003. LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary may carry out a program for ecosystem restoration, Louisiana Coastal Area, Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated January 31, 2005.

(b) *PRIORITIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to—

(A) any portion of the program identified in the report described in subsection (a) as a critical restoration feature;

(B) any Mississippi River diversion project that—

(i) will protect a major population area of the Pontchartrain, Pearl, Breton Sound, Barataria, or Terrebonne basins; and

(ii) will produce an environmental benefit to the coastal Louisiana ecosystem;

(C) any barrier island, or barrier shoreline, project that—

(i) will be carried out in conjunction with a Mississippi River diversion project; and

(ii) will protect a major population area;

(D) any project that will reduce storm surge and prevent or reduce the risk of loss of human life and the risk to public safety; and

(E) a project to physically modify the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet and to restore the areas affected by the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet in accordance with the comprehensive plan to be developed under section 7002(a) and consistent with sections 7006(c)(1)(A) and 7013.

**SEC. 7004. COASTAL LOUISIANA ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND RESTORATION TASK FORCE.**

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established a task force to be known as the Coastal Louisiana

Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force (in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) *MEMBERSHIP.*—The Task Force shall consist of the following members (or, in the case of the head of a Federal agency, a designee of the head of the agency at the level of Assistant Secretary or an equivalent level):

(1) The Secretary.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior.

(3) The Secretary of Commerce.

(4) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(5) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) The Secretary of Transportation.

(7) The Secretary of Energy.

(8) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(9) The Commandant of the Coast Guard.

(10) The Chair of the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana.

(11) Two representatives of the State of Louisiana selected by the Governor.

(c) *DUTIES.*—The Task Force shall make recommendations to the Secretary regarding—

(1) policies, strategies, plans, programs, projects, and activities for addressing conservation, protection, restoration, and maintenance of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem;

(2) financial participation by each agency represented on the Task Force in conserving, protecting, restoring, and maintaining the coastal Louisiana ecosystem, including recommendations—

(A) that identify funds from current agency missions and budgets; and

(B) for coordinating individual agency budget requests; and

(3) the comprehensive plan to be developed under section 7002(a).

(d) *REPORT.*—The Task Force shall submit to Congress a biennial report that summarizes the activities and recommendations of the Task Force.

(e) *WORKING GROUPS.*—

(1) *GENERAL AUTHORITY.*—The Task Force may establish such working groups as the Task Force determines to be necessary to assist the Task Force in carrying out this section.

(2) *HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA.*—

(A) *INTEGRATION TEAM.*—The Task Force shall establish a working group for the purpose of advising the Task Force of opportunities to integrate the planning, engineering, design, implementation, and performance of Corps of Engineers projects for hurricane and storm damage reduction, flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and navigation in those areas in Louisiana for which a major disaster has been declared by the President as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Rita.

(B) *EXPERTISE; REPRESENTATION.*—In establishing the working group under subparagraph (A), the Task Force shall ensure that the group—

(i) has expertise in coastal estuaries, diversions, coastal restoration and wetlands protection, ecosystem restoration, hurricane protection, storm damage reduction systems, navigation, and ports; and

(ii) represents the State of Louisiana and local governments in southern Louisiana.

(C) *DUTIES.*—In developing its recommendations under this subsection, the working group shall—

(i) review reports relating to the performance of, and recommendations relating to the future performance of, the hurricane, coastal, and flood protection systems in southern Louisiana, including the reports issued by the Interagency Performance Evaluation Team, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and Team Louisiana for the purpose of advising the Task Force and the Secretary on opportunities to improve the performance of the protection systems;

(ii) assist in providing reviews under section 2035; and

(iii) carry out such other duties as the Task Force or the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(f) **COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Task Force and members of a working group established by the Task Force may not receive compensation for their services as members of the Task Force or working group, as the case may be.

(g) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Travel expenses incurred by members of the Task Force and members of a working group established by the Task Force, in the performance of their service on the Task Force or working group, as the case may be, shall be paid by the agency or entity that the member represents.

(h) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Task Force or any working group established by the Task Force.

#### **SEC. 7005. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.**

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Secretary, in cooperation with the non-Federal interest of the project involved, shall review each Federally-authorized water resources project in the coastal Louisiana ecosystem being carried out or completed as of the date of enactment of this Act to determine whether the project needs to be modified—

(1) to take into account the program authorized by section 7003 and the projects authorized by sections 7006(e) and 7013; or

(2) to contribute to ecosystem restoration under section 7003, 7006(e), or 7013.

(b) **MODIFICATIONS.**—Subject to subsections (c) and (d), the Secretary may carry out the modifications described in subsection (a).

(c) **PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.**—Before completing the report required under subsection (d), the Secretary shall provide an opportunity for public notice and comment.

##### **(d) REPORT.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before modifying an operation or feature of a project under subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the modification.

(2) **INCLUSION.**—A report describing a modification under paragraph (1) shall include such information relating to the timeline for and cost of the modification, as the Secretary determines to be relevant.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000.

#### **SEC. 7006. CONSTRUCTION.**

##### **(a) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a coastal Louisiana ecosystem science and technology program substantially in accordance with the restoration plan at a total cost of \$100,000,000.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the program shall be—

(A) to identify any uncertainty relating to the physical, chemical, geological, biological, and cultural baseline conditions in the coastal Louisiana ecosystem;

(B) to improve knowledge of the physical, chemical, geological, biological, and cultural baseline conditions in the coastal Louisiana ecosystem;

(C) to identify and develop technologies, models, and methods to carry out this subsection; and

(D) to advance and expedite the implementation of the comprehensive plan.

(3) **WORKING GROUPS.**—The Secretary may establish such working groups as the Secretary determines to be necessary to assist the Secretary in carrying out this subsection.

(4) **CONTRACTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may enter into a contract or cooperative agreement with a consortium of academic institutions in Louisiana with scientific or engineering expertise in the restoration of aquatic and marine ecosystems for coastal restoration and enhancement through science and technology.

neering expertise in the restoration of aquatic and marine ecosystems for coastal restoration and enhancement through science and technology.

(5) **APPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to a working group established under this subsection.

##### **(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may carry out demonstration projects substantially in accordance with the restoration plan and within the coastal Louisiana ecosystem for the purpose of resolving critical areas of scientific or technological uncertainty related to the implementation of the comprehensive plan.

##### **(2) MAXIMUM COST.—**

(A) **TOTAL COST.**—The total cost for planning, design, and construction of all projects under this subsection shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

(B) **INDIVIDUAL PROJECT.**—The total cost of any single project under this subsection shall not exceed \$25,000,000.

##### **(c) INITIAL PROJECTS.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to carry out the following projects substantially in accordance with the restoration plan:

(A) Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet environmental restoration at a total cost of \$105,300,000, but not including those elements of the project that produce navigation benefits.

(B) Small diversion at Hope Canal at a total cost of \$68,600,000.

(C) Barataria basin barrier shoreline restoration at a total cost of \$242,600,000.

(D) Small Bayou Lafourche reintroduction at a total cost of \$133,500,000.

(E) Medium diversion at Myrtle Grove with dedicated dredging at a total cost of \$278,300,000.

##### **(2) MODIFICATIONS.—**

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out each project under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall carry out such modifications as may be necessary to the ecosystem restoration features identified in the restoration plan—

(i) to address the impacts of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on the areas of the project; and

(ii) to ensure consistency with the project authorized by section 7013 (including work in and around the vicinity of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet).

(B) **INTEGRATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that each modification under subparagraph (A) is taken into account in conducting the study of comprehensive hurricane protection authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2247).

(C) **MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET.**—In carrying out the project under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall carry out such modifications as may be necessary to make the project consistent with and complementary to the closure and restoration of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet authorized by section 7013.

(3) **CONSTRUCTION REPORTS.**—Before the Secretary may begin construction of any project under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report documenting any modifications to the project, including cost changes, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(4) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.**—Notwithstanding section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280), the cost of a project under this subsection, including any modifications to the project, shall not exceed 150 percent of the cost of such project set forth in paragraph (1).

##### **(d) BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, substantially in accordance with the restoration plan, shall implement in the coastal Louisiana ecosystem a

program for the beneficial use of material dredged from federally maintained waterways at a total cost of \$100,000,000.

(2) **CONSIDERATION.**—In carrying out the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the beneficial use of sediment from the Illinois River System for wetlands restoration in wetlands-depleted watersheds of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem.

##### **(e) ADDITIONAL PROJECTS.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to carry out the following projects referred to in the restoration plan if the Secretary determines such projects are feasible:

(A) Land Bridge between Caillou Lake and the Gulf of Mexico at a total cost of \$56,300,000.

(B) Gulf Shoreline at Point Au Fer Island at a total cost of \$43,400,000.

(C) Modification of Caernarvon Diversion at a total cost of \$20,700,000.

(D) Modification of Davis Pond Diversion at a total cost of \$64,200,000.

(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than December 31, 2009, the Secretary shall submit feasibility reports on the projects described in paragraph (1) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

##### **(3) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO REPORTS.—**

(A) **FEASIBILITY REPORTS.**—Not later than December 31, 2008, the Secretary shall submit to Congress feasibility reports on the following projects referred to in the restoration plan:

(i) Multipurpose Operation of Houma Navigation Lock at a total cost of \$18,100,000.

(ii) Terrebonne Basin Barrier Shoreline Restoration at a total cost of \$124,600,000.

(iii) Small Diversion at Convent/Blind River at a total cost of \$88,000,000.

(iv) Amite River Diversion Canal Modification at a total cost of \$5,600,000.

(v) Medium Diversion at White's Ditch at a total cost of \$86,100,000.

(vi) Convey Atchafalaya River Water to Northern Terrebonne Marshes at a total cost of \$221,200,000.

(B) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The Secretary may carry out the projects under subparagraph (A) substantially in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions, recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers if a favorable report of the Chief is completed by not later than December 31, 2010.

(4) **CONSTRUCTION.**—No appropriations shall be made to construct any project under this subsection if the report under paragraph (2) or paragraph (3), as the case may be, has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

#### **SEC. 7007. NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.**

(a) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a study or project under this title the cost of work carried out in the coastal Louisiana ecosystem by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the execution of the partnership agreement for the study or project.

(b) **SOURCES OF FUNDS.**—The non-Federal interest may use, and the Secretary shall accept, funds provided by a Federal agency under any other Federal program, to satisfy, in whole or in part, the non-Federal share of the cost of the study or project if the Federal agency that provides the funds determines that the funds are authorized to be used to carry out the study or project.

(c) **NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—A nongovernmental organization shall be eligible to contribute all or a portion of the non-Federal share of the cost of a project under this title.

(d) **TREATMENT OF CREDIT BETWEEN PROJECTS.**—Any credit provided under this section toward the non-Federal share of the cost of

a study or project under this title may be applied toward the non-Federal share of the cost of any other study or project under this title.

(e) **PERIODIC MONITORING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To ensure that the contributions of the non-Federal interest equal the non-Federal share of the cost of a study or project under this title during each 5-year period beginning after the date of commencement of the first study or project under this title, the Secretary shall—

(A) monitor for each study or project under this title the non-Federal provision of cash, in-kind services and materials, and land, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas; and

(B) manage the requirement of the non-Federal interest to provide for each such study or project cash, in-kind services and materials, and land, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas.

(2) **OTHER MONITORING.**—The Secretary shall conduct monitoring separately for the study phase, construction phase, preconstruction engineering and design phase, and planning phase for each project authorized on or after the date of enactment of this Act for all or any portion of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem.

(f) **AUDITS.**—Credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas (including land value and incidental costs) provided under this section, and the cost of work provided under this section, shall be subject to audit by the Secretary.

**SEC. 7008. PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962–2) or any other provision of law, in carrying out any project or activity under this title or any other provision of law to protect, conserve, and restore the coastal Louisiana ecosystem, the Secretary may determine that—

(1) the project or activity is justified by the environmental benefits derived by the coastal Louisiana ecosystem; and

(2) no further economic justification for the project or activity shall be required if the Secretary determines that the project or activity is cost effective.

(b) **LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any separable element of a project intended to produce benefits that are predominantly unrelated to the protection, preservation, and restoration of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem.

**SEC. 7009. INDEPENDENT REVIEW.**

The Secretary shall establish a council, to be known as the “Louisiana Water Resources Council”, which shall serve as the exclusive peer review panel for activities conducted by the Corps of Engineers in the areas in the State of Louisiana declared as major disaster areas in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) in response to Hurricane Katrina or Rita of 2005, in accordance with the requirements of section 2034.

**SEC. 7010. EXPEDITED REPORTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reports for the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, proceed directly to project preconstruction engineering and design:

(1) The projects identified in the study of comprehensive hurricane protection authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2447).

(2) The projects identified in the Southwest Coastal Louisiana hurricane and storm damage reduction study authorized by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on December 7, 2005.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.**—Upon completion of the reports identified in subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit the reports to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transpor-

tation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 7011. REPORTING.**

Not later than 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report, including a description of—

(1) the projects authorized and undertaken under this title;

(2) the construction status of the projects;

(3) the cost to date and the expected final cost of each project undertaken under this title; and

(4) the benefits and environmental impacts of the projects.

**SEC. 7012. NEW ORLEANS AND VICINITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to—

(1) raise levee heights where necessary and otherwise enhance the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project and the West Bank and Vicinity project to provide the level of protection necessary to achieve the certification required for a 100-year level of flood protection in accordance with the national flood insurance program under the base flood elevations current at the time of construction of the levee;

(2) modify the 17th Street, Orleans Avenue, and London Avenue drainage canals in the city of New Orleans and install pumps and closure structures at or near the lakefront at Lake Pontchartrain;

(3) armor critical elements of the New Orleans hurricane and storm damage reduction system;

(4) modify the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal to increase the reliability of the flood protection system for the city of New Orleans;

(5) replace or modify certain non-Federal levees in Plaquemines Parish to incorporate the levees into the New Orleans to Venice Hurricane Protection project;

(6) reinforce or replace flood walls in the existing Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project and the existing West Bank and Vicinity project to improve performance of the flood and storm damage reduction systems;

(7) perform one time stormproofing of interior pump stations to ensure the operability of the stations during hurricanes, storms, and high water events;

(8) repair, replace, modify and improve non-Federal levees and associated protection measures in Terrebonne Parish; and

(9) reduce the risk of storm damage to the greater New Orleans metropolitan area by restoring the surrounding wetlands through measures to begin to reverse wetland losses in areas affected by navigation, oil and gas, and other channels and through modification of the Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion structure or its operations.

(b) **COST SHARING.**—Activities authorized by subsection (a) and section 7013 shall be carried out in a manner that is consistent with the cost-sharing requirements specified in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109-234).

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate if estimates for the expenditure of funds on any single project or activity identified in subsection (a) exceeds the amount specified for that project or activity in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006. No appropriation in excess of 25 percent above the amount specified for a project or activity in such Act may be made until an increase in the level of expenditure has been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

**SEC. 7013. MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET.**

(a) **DEAUTHORIZATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective beginning on the date of submission of the plan required under paragraph (3), the navigation channel portion of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet element of the project for navigation, Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, authorized by the Act entitled “An Act to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet”, approved March 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 65) and modified by section 844 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4177) and section 326 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3717), which extends from the Gulf of Mexico to Mile 60 at the southern bank of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, is not authorized.

(2) **SCOPE.**—Nothing in this paragraph modifies or deauthorizes the Inner Harbor navigation canal replacement project authorized by that Act of March 29, 1956.

(3) **CLOSURE AND RESTORATION PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a final report on the deauthorization of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet, as described under the heading “INVESTIGATIONS” under chapter 3 of title II of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (120 Stat. 453).

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—At a minimum, the report under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a plan to physically modify the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet and restore the areas affected by the navigation channel;

(ii) a plan to restore natural features of the ecosystem that will reduce or prevent damage from storm surge;

(iii) a plan to prevent the intrusion of saltwater into the waterway;

(iv) efforts to integrate the recommendations of the report with the program authorized under section 7003 and the analysis and design authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2247); and

(v) consideration of—

(I) use of native vegetation; and

(II) diversions of fresh water to restore the Lake Borgne ecosystem.

(4) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The Secretary shall carry out a plan to close the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet and restore and protect the ecosystem substantially in accordance with the plan required under paragraph (3), if the Secretary determines that the project is cost-effective, environmentally acceptable, and technically feasible.

**SEC. 7014. HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION.**

(a) **REPORTS.**—With respect to the projects identified in the analysis and design of comprehensive hurricane protection authorized by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2247), the Secretary shall submit, to the maximum extent practicable, specific project recommendations in a report developed under that title.

(b) **EMERGENCY PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the President determines that a project recommended in the analysis and design of comprehensive hurricane protection under title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 could—

(A) address an imminent threat to life and property;

(B) prevent a dangerous storm surge from reaching a populated area;

(C) prevent the loss of coastal areas that reduce the impact of storm surge;

(D) benefit national energy security;

(E) protect emergency hurricane evacuation routes or shelters; or



(F) address inconsistencies in hurricane protection standards, the President may submit to the President pro tempore of the Senate for authorization a legislative proposal relating to the project, as the President determines to be appropriate.

(2) **PRIORITIZATION.**—In submitting legislative proposals under paragraph (1), the President shall give priority to any project that, as determined by the President, would—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, reduce the risk—

- (i) of loss of human life;
  - (ii) to public safety; and
  - (iii) of damage to property; and
- (B) minimize costs and environmental impacts.

(3) **EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning after December 31, 2008, any legislative proposal submitted by the President under paragraph (1) shall be eligible for expedited consideration in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) **INTRODUCTION.**—As soon as practicable after the date of receipt of a legislative proposal under paragraph (1), the Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall introduce the proposal as a bill, by request, in the Senate.

(C) **REFERRAL.**—A bill introduced under subparagraph (B) shall be referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(D) **COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 45 legislative days after a bill under subparagraph (B) is referred to the committee in accordance with subparagraph (C), the committee shall act on the bill.

(ii) **FAILURE TO ACT.**—If the committee fails to act on a bill by the date specified in clause (i), the bill shall be discharged from the committee and placed on the calendar of the Senate.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The requirements of, and authorities under, this subsection shall expire on December 31, 2010.

#### **SEC. 7015. LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW.**

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing any modification required to the project for flood damage reduction, Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana, to provide the level of protection necessary to achieve the certification required for a 100-year level of flood protection in accordance with the national flood insurance program.

(b) **MODIFICATIONS.**—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a modification described in subsection (a) if—

(1) the Secretary determines that the modification in the report under subsection (a) is feasible; and

(2) the total cost of the modification does not exceed \$90,000,000.

(c) **REQUIREMENT.**—No appropriation shall be made to construct any modification under this section if the report under subsection (a) has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

#### **SEC. 7016. LOWER JEFFERSON PARISH, LOUISIANA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out a project for flood damage reduction in Lower Jefferson Parish, Louisiana.

(b) **EXISTING STUDIES.**—In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall use, to the maximum extent practicable, existing studies for projects for flood damage reduction in the vicinity of Lower Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, prepared under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The Secretary may proceed to construction or complete the construction of projects in Lower Jefferson Parish if the projects are being developed or carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to carry out this section.

### **TITLE VIII—UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATER-WAY SYSTEM**

#### **SEC. 8001. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) **PLAN.**—The term “Plan” means the project for navigation and ecosystem improvements for the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 15, 2004.

(2) **UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM.**—The term “Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System” means the projects for navigation and ecosystem restoration authorized by Congress for—

(A) the segment of the Mississippi River from the confluence with the Ohio River, River Mile 0.0, to Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota, River Mile 854.0; and

(B) the Illinois Waterway from its confluence with the Mississippi River at Grafton, Illinois, River Mile 0.0, to T.J. O'Brien Lock in Chicago, Illinois, River Mile 327.0.

#### **SEC. 8002. NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS AND RESTORATION.**

Except as modified by this title, the Secretary shall undertake navigation improvements and restoration of the ecosystem for the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System substantially in accordance with the Plan and subject to the conditions described therein.

#### **SEC. 8003. AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS.**

(a) **SMALL SCALE AND NONSTRUCTURAL MEASURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) construct mooring facilities at Locks 12, 14, 18, 20, 22, 24, and LaGrange Lock or other alternative locations that are economically and environmentally feasible;

(B) provide switchboats at Locks 20 through 25; and

(C) conduct development and testing of an appointment scheduling system.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—The total cost of projects authorized under this subsection shall be \$256,000,000. Such costs are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(b) **NEW LOCKS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall construct new 1,200-foot locks at Locks 20, 21, 22, 24, and 25 on the Upper Mississippi River and at LaGrange Lock and Peoria Lock on the Illinois Waterway.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—The total cost of projects authorized under this subsection shall be \$1,948,000,000. Such costs are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(c) **CONCURRENCE.**—The mitigation required for the projects authorized under subsections (a) and (b), including any acquisition of lands or interests in lands, shall be undertaken or acquired concurrently with lands and interests in lands for the projects authorized under subsections (a) and (b), and physical construction required for the purposes of mitigation shall be undertaken concurrently with the physical construction of such projects.

#### **SEC. 8004. ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AUTHORIZATION.**

(a) **OPERATION.**—To ensure the environmental sustainability of the existing Upper Mississippi

River and Illinois Waterway System, the Secretary shall modify, consistent with requirements to avoid adverse effects on navigation, the operation of the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System to address the cumulative environmental impacts of operation of the system and improve the ecological integrity of the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River.

(b) **ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out, consistent with requirements to avoid adverse effects on navigation, ecosystem restoration projects to attain and maintain the sustainability of the ecosystem of the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River in accordance with the general framework outlined in the Plan.

(2) **PROJECTS INCLUDED.**—Ecosystem restoration projects may include—

- (A) island building;
- (B) construction of fish passages;
- (C) floodplain restoration;
- (D) water level management (including water drawdown);
- (E) backwater restoration;
- (F) side channel restoration;
- (G) wing dam and dike restoration and modification;

(H) island and shoreline protection;

(I) topographical diversity;

(J) dam point control;

(K) use of dredged material for environmental purposes;

(L) tributary confluence restoration;

(M) spillway, dam, and levee modification to benefit the environment; and

(N) land and easement acquisition.

(3) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Federal share of the cost of carrying out an ecosystem restoration project under this subsection shall be 65 percent.

(B) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN RESTORATION PROJECTS.**—In the case of a project under this section for ecosystem restoration, the Federal share of the cost of carrying out the project shall be 100 percent if the project—

(i) is located below the ordinary high water mark or in a connected backwater;

(ii) modifies the operation of structures for navigation; or

(iii) is located on federally owned land.

(C) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this subsection affects the applicability of section 906(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(e)).

(D) **NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), for any project carried out under this title, a non-Federal sponsor may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.

(4) **LAND ACQUISITION.**—The Secretary may acquire land or an interest in land for an ecosystem restoration project from a willing seller through conveyance of—

(A) fee title to the land; or

(B) a flood plain conservation easement.

(c) **MONITORING.**—The Secretary shall carry out a long term resource monitoring, computerized data inventory and analysis, and applied research program for the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River to determine trends in ecosystem health, to understand systemic changes, and to help identify restoration needs. The program shall consider and adopt the monitoring program established under section 1103(e)(1)(A)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)(1)(A)(ii)).

(d) **ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.**—

(1) **RESTORATION DESIGN.**—Before initiating the construction of any individual ecosystem restoration project, the Secretary shall—

(A) establish ecosystem restoration goals and identify specific performance measures designed to demonstrate ecosystem restoration;

(B) establish the without-project condition or baseline for each performance indicator; and

(C) for each separable element of the ecosystem restoration, identify specific target goals for each performance indicator.

(2) **OUTCOMES.**—Performance measures identified under paragraph (1)(A) shall include specific measurable environmental outcomes, such as changes in water quality, hydrology, or the well-being of indicator species the population and distribution of which are representative of the abundance and diversity of ecosystem-dependent aquatic and terrestrial species.

(3) **RESTORATION DESIGN.**—Restoration design carried out as part of ecosystem restoration shall include a monitoring plan for the performance measures identified under paragraph (1)(A), including—

(A) a timeline to achieve the identified target goals; and

(B) a timeline for the demonstration of project completion.

(e) **CONSULTATION AND FUNDING AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the environmental sustainability, ecosystem restoration, and monitoring activities authorized in this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.

(2) **FUNDING AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with the Secretary of the Interior, the Upper Mississippi River Basin Association, and natural resource and conservation agencies of the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin to provide for the direct participation of and transfer of funds to such entities for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of projects and programs established by this section.

(f) **SPECIFIC PROJECTS AUTHORIZATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$1,717,000,000, of which not more than \$245,000,000 shall be available for projects described in subsection (b)(2)(B) and not more than \$48,000,000 shall be available for projects described in subsection (b)(2)(J). Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(2) **LIMITATION ON AVAILABLE FUNDS.**—Of the amounts made available under paragraph (1), not more than \$35,000,000 in any fiscal year may be used for land acquisition under subsection (b)(4).

(3) **INDIVIDUAL PROJECT LIMIT.**—Other than for projects described in subparagraphs (B) and (J) of subsection (b)(2), the total cost of any single project carried out under this subsection shall not exceed \$25,000,000.

(4) **MONITORING.**—In addition to amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized \$10,420,000 per fiscal year to carry out the monitoring program under subsection (c) if such sums are not appropriated pursuant to section 1103(e)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)(4)).

(g) **IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than June 30, 2009, and every 4 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an implementation report that—

(A) includes baselines, milestones, goals, and priorities for ecosystem restoration projects; and

(B) measures the progress in meeting the goals.

(2) **ADVISORY PANEL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall appoint and convene an advisory panel to provide independent guidance in the development of each implementation report under paragraph (1).

(B) **PANEL MEMBERS.**—Panel members shall include—

(i) one representative of each of the State resource agencies (or a designee of the Governor of the State) from each of the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin;

(ii) one representative of the Department of Agriculture;

(iii) one representative of the Department of Transportation;

(iv) one representative of the United States Geological Survey;

(v) one representative of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

(vi) one representative of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(vii) one representative of affected landowners;

(viii) two representatives of conservation and environmental advocacy groups; and

(ix) two representatives of agriculture and industry advocacy groups.

(C) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Secretary shall serve as chairperson of the advisory panel.

(D) **APPLICATION OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Advisory Panel and any working group established by the Advisory Panel shall not be considered an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(h) **RANKING SYSTEM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Panel, shall develop a system to rank proposed projects.

(2) **PRIORITY.**—The ranking system shall give greater weight to projects that restore natural river processes, including those projects listed in subsection (b)(2).

#### **SEC. 9005. COMPARABLE PROGRESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As the Secretary conducts pre-engineering, design, and construction for projects authorized under this title, the Secretary shall—

(1) select appropriate milestones;

(2) determine, at the time of such selection, whether the projects are being carried out at comparable rates; and

(3) make an annual report to Congress, beginning in fiscal year 2009, regarding whether the projects are being carried out at a comparable rate.

(b) **NO COMPARABLE RATE.**—If the Secretary or Congress determines under subsection (a)(2) that projects authorized under this title are not moving toward completion at a comparable rate, annual funding requests for the projects shall be adjusted to ensure that the projects move toward completion at a comparable rate in the future.

### **TITLE IX—NATIONAL LEEVE SAFETY PROGRAM**

#### **SEC. 9001. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “National Levee Safety Act of 2007”.

#### **SEC. 9002. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) **COMMITTEE.**—The term “committee” means the Committee on Levee Safety established by section 9003(a).

(2) **INSPECTION.**—The term “inspection” means an actual inspection of a levee—

(A) to establish the global information system location of the levee;

(B) to determine the general condition of the levee; and

(C) to estimate the number of structures and population at risk and protected by the levee that would be adversely impacted if the levee fails or water levels exceed the height of the levee.

(3) **LEEVE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “levee” means an embankment, including floodwalls—

(i) the primary purpose of which is to provide hurricane, storm, and flood protection relating to seasonal high water, storm surges, precipitation, and other weather events; and

(ii) that normally is subject to water loading for only a few days or weeks during a year.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term includes structures along canals that constrain water flows and are subject to more frequent water loadings but that do not constitute a barrier across a watercourse.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(5) **STATE LEEVE SAFETY AGENCY.**—The term “State levee safety agency” means the agency of a State that has regulatory authority over the safety of any non-Federal levee in the State.

(6) **UNITED STATES.**—The term “United States”, when used in a geographical sense, means all of the States.

#### **SEC. 9003. COMMITTEE ON LEEVE SAFETY.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a committee to be known as the “Committee on Levee Safety”.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The committee shall be composed of 16 members as follows:

(1) The Secretary (or the Secretary’s designee), who shall serve as the chairperson of the Committee.

(2) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or the Administrator’s designee).

(3) The following 14 members appointed by the Secretary:

(A) 8 representatives of State levee safety agencies, one from each of the 8 civil works divisions of the Corps of Engineers.

(B) 2 representatives of the private sector who have expertise in levee safety.

(C) 2 representatives of local and regional governmental agencies who have expertise in levee safety.

(D) 2 representatives of Indian tribes who have expertise in levee safety.

(c) **DUTIES.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL LEEVE SAFETY PROGRAM.**—The committee shall develop recommendations for a national levee safety program, including a strategic plan for implementation of the program.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the committee shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the recommendations developed under paragraph (1).

(d) **PURPOSES.**—In developing recommendations under subsection (c)(1), the committee shall ensure that the national levee safety program meets the following goals:

(1) Ensuring the protection of human life and property by levees through the development of technologically, economically, socially, and environmentally feasible programs and procedures for hazard reduction and mitigation relating to levees.

(2) Encouraging use of the best available engineering policies and procedures for levee site investigation, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and emergency preparedness.

(3) Encouraging the establishment and implementation of an effective national levee safety program that may be delegated to qualified States for implementation, including identification of incentives and disincentives for State levee safety programs.

(4) Ensuring that levees are operated and maintained in accordance with appropriate and protective standards by conducting an inventory and inspection of levees.

(5) Developing and supporting public education and awareness projects to increase public acceptance and support of State and national levee safety programs.

(6) Building public awareness of the residual risks associated with living in levee protected areas.

(7) Developing technical assistance materials for State and national levee safety programs.

(8) Developing methods to provide technical assistance relating to levee safety to non-Federal entities.

(9) Developing technical assistance materials, seminars, and guidelines relating to the physical integrity of levees in the United States.

(e) **COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.**—A member of the committee shall serve without compensation.

(f) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—To the extent amounts are made available in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary shall reimburse a member of the committee for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of a Federal agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in performance of services for the committee.

(g) **APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the committee.

#### **SEC. 9004. INVENTORY AND INSPECTION OF LEVEES.**

(a) **LEEVE DATABASE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and maintain a database with an inventory of the Nation's levees.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The database shall include—

(A) location information of all Federal levees in the Nation (including global information system information) and, for non-Federal levees, such information on levee location as is provided to the Secretary by State and local governmental agencies;

(B) utilizing such information as is available, the general condition of each levee; and

(C) an estimate of the number of structures and population at risk and protected by each levee that would be adversely impacted if the levee fails or water levels exceed the height of the levee.

(3) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—

(A) **AVAILABILITY TO FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.**—The Secretary shall make all of the information in the database available to appropriate Federal, State, and local governmental agencies.

(B) **AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.**—The Secretary shall make the information in the database described in paragraph (2)(A), and such other information in the database as the Secretary determines appropriate, available to the public.

(b) **INVENTORY AND INSPECTION OF LEVEES.**—

(1) **FEDERAL LEVEES.**—The Secretary, at Federal expense, shall establish an inventory and conduct an inspection of all federally owned and operated levees.

(2) **FEDERALLY CONSTRUCTED, NONFEDERALLY OPERATED AND MAINTAINED LEVEES.**—The Secretary shall establish an inventory and conduct an inspection of all federally constructed, non-federally operated and maintained levees, at the original cost share for the project.

(3) **PARTICIPATING LEVEES.**—For non-Federal levees the owners of which are participating in the emergency response to natural disasters program established under section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), the Secretary shall establish an inventory and conduct an inspection of each such levee if the owner of the levee requests such inspection. The Federal share of the cost of an inspection under this paragraph shall be 65 percent.

#### **SEC. 9005. LIMITATIONS ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this title shall be construed as—

(1) creating any liability of the United States or its officers or employees for the recovery of damages caused by an action or failure to act; or

(2) relieving an owner or operator of a levee of a legal duty, obligation, or liability incident to the ownership or operation of a levee.

#### **SEC. 9006. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013.

And the Senate agree to the same.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JAMES L. OBERSTAR,  
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,  
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER,  
BRIAN BAIRD,  
BRIAN HIGGINS,  
HARRY E. MITCHELL,  
STEVE KAGEN,  
JERRY MCNERNEY,  
JOHN L. MICA,  
JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr.,  
VERNON J. EHLERS,  
R.H. BAKER,  
HENRY E. BROWN, Jr.,  
JOHN BOOZMAN,

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 2014, 2023, and 6009 of the House bill and secs. 3023, 5008, and 5016 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

NICK RAHALL,  
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,  
CATHY McMORRIS  
RODGERS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

BARBARA BOXER,  
MAX BAUCUS,  
JOE LIEBERMAN,  
TOM CARPER,  
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON,  
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,  
JAMES M. INHOFE,  
JOHN WARNER,  
GEORGE V. VOINOVICH,  
JOHNNY ISAKSON,  
DAVID VITTER,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### **JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE**

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1495) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

#### **TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS**

##### **SECTION 1001—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS**

1001(1). Haines, Alaska. House §1001(1), Senate §1001(1).—Senate recedes.

1001(2). Port Lions, Alaska. House §1001(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1001(3). Santa Cruz River, Paseo de Las Iglesias, Arizona. House §1001(4). No comparable Senate Section.—Senate recedes.

1001(4). Tanque Verde Creek, Pima County, Arizona. House §1001(5), Senate §1001(2).—House recedes.

1001(5). Salt River (Rio Salado Oeste), Maricopa County, Arizona. House §1001(3). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1001(6). Salt River (Va Shly'ay Akimel), Maricopa County, Arizona. House §1001(6), Senate §1001(3).—House recedes, with an amendment.

1001(7). May Branch, Fort Smith, Arkansas. House §1001(7), Senate §1001(4).—House recedes.

1001(8). Hamilton City, Glenn County, California. House §1001(8), Senate §1001(5).—House recedes.

1001(9). Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California. House §1001(9), Senate §1001(6).—House recedes.

1001(10). Matilija Dam, Ventura County, California. House §1001(10), Senate §1001(7).—House recedes.

1001(11). Middle Creek, Lake County, California. House §1001(11), Senate §1001(8).—House recedes.

1001(12). Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California. House §1001(12), Senate §1001(9).—Senate recedes.

1001(13). Denver County Reach, South Platte River, Denver, Colorado. House §1001(13), Senate §1001(10).—Senate recedes.

1001(14). Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon. House §6005, Senate §1001(2).—House recedes.

1001(15). Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Picayune Strand Restoration Project, Collier County, Florida. House §6005, Senate §1001(14).—House recedes.

1001(16). Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Site 1 Impoundment Project, Palm Beach County, Florida. House §6005, Senate §1001(11).—House recedes.

1001(17). Miami Harbor, Miami-Dade County, Florida. House §1001(14), Senate §1001(13).—Senate recedes.

1001(18). East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois. House §1001(15), Senate §1001(15).—Senate recedes.

1001(19). Peoria Riverfront Development, Illinois. House §1001(16), Senate §1001(16).—House recedes.

1001(20). Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois. House §1001(17), Senate §1001(17).—House recedes.

1001(21). Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, Des Moines, Iowa. House §1001(18), Senate §1001(18).—Senate recedes.

1001(22). Licking River Basin, Cynthiana, Kentucky. House §1001(19). No comparable Senate Section.—Senate recedes.

1001(23). Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana. House §1001(20), Senate §1001(19).—House recedes.

1001(24). Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana. House §1001(21), Senate §1001(20).—House recedes.

1001(25). Port of Iberia, Louisiana. House §1001(22), Senate §1001(21).—House recedes, with an amendment.

1001(26). Smith Island, Somerset County, Maryland. House §1001(23), Senate §1001(23).—House recedes.

1001(27). Roseau River, Roseau, Minnesota. House §1001(24), Senate §1001(24).—Senate recedes.

1001(28). Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, and North Kansas Levees Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas. House §1001(26), Senate §1001(26).—House recedes.

1001(29). Swope Park Industrial Area, Blue River, Kansas City, Missouri. House §1001(27), Senate §1001(27).—Senate recedes.

1001(30). Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey. House §1001(28), Senate §1001(28).—House recedes.

1001(31). Hudson Raritan Estuary, Liberty State Park, New Jersey. House §1001(29), Senate §1001(29).—Senate recedes.

1001(32). New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey. House §1001(30), Senate §1001(30).—Senate recedes.

1001(33). Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Union Beach, New Jersey. House §1001(31), Senate §1001(31).—House recedes.

1001(34). South River, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey. House §1001(32), Senate §1001(32).—House recedes.

1001(35). Southwest Valley, Bernalillo County, New Mexico. House §1001(33), Senate §1001(33).—House recedes.

1001(36). Montauk Point, New York. House §1001(34), Senate §1001(34).—Senate recedes.

1001(37). Hocking River Basin, Monday Creek, Ohio. House §1001(35), Senate §1001(35).—House recedes, with an amendment.

1001(38). Town of Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pennsylvania. House §1001(36), Senate §1001(36).—Senate recedes.

1001(39). Pawleys Island, South Carolina. House §1001(37), Senate §1001(37).—Senate recedes.

1001(40). Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, Texas. House §1001(38), Senate §1001(38).—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

1001(41). Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazos River to Port O'Connor, Matagorda Bay Re-Route, Texas. House §1001(39), Senate §1001(39).—House recedes.

1001(42). Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, High Island to Brazos River, Texas. House §1001(40), Senate §1001(40).—House recedes.

1001(43). Lower Colorado River Basin Phase I, Texas. House §1001(41), Senate §1001(41).—Senate recedes.

1001(44). Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement, Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia. House §1001(43), Senate §1001(43).—Senate recedes.

1001(45). Craney Island Eastward Expansion, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Hampton Roads, Virginia. House §1001(44), Senate §1001(42).—House recedes, with an amendment.

1001(46). Centralia, Chehalis River, Lewis County, Washington. Senate §1001(44). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 1002. SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION

1002(a)(1). Haleyville, Alabama. House §1002(a)(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(2). Weiss Lake, Alabama. House §1002(a)(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(3). Fort Yukon, Alaska. House §5032. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

1002(a)(4). Little Colorado River Levee, Arizona. House §1002(a)(3). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(5). Cache River Basin, Grubbs, Arkansas. House §1002(a)(4), Senate §1004(1).—Same.

1002(a)(6). Barrel Springs Wash, Palmdale, California. House §1002(a)(5). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(7). Borrego Springs, California. House §1002(a)(6). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(8). Colton, California. House §1002(a)(7). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(9). Dunlap Stream, Yucaipa, California. House §1002(a)(8). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(10). Hunts Canyon Wash, Palmdale, California. House §1002(a)(9). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(11). Ontario and Chino, California. House §1002(a)(10). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(12). Santa Venetia, California. House §1002(a)(11). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(13). Whittier, California. House §1002(a)(12). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(14). Wildwood Creek, Yucaipa, California. House §1002(a)(13). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(15). Bibb County and City of Macon Levee, Georgia. Senate §1004(2). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1002(a)(16). Fort Wayne and Vicinity, Indiana. Senate §1004(3). House §3051.—House recedes, with an amendment.

1002(a)(17). St. Francisville, Louisiana. House §1002(a)(14). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(18). Salem, Massachusetts. House §1002(a)(15), Senate 1004(4).—Same.

1002(a)(19). Cass River, Michigan. House §1002(a)(16). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(20). Crow River, Rockford, Minnesota. House §1002(a)(17), Senate §1004(5).—Same.

1002(a)(21). Marsh Creek, Minnesota. House §1002(a)(18). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(22). South Branch of the Wild Rice River, Borup, Minnesota. House §1002(a)(19), Senate §1004(6).—Same.

1002(a)(23). Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, Missouri. House §1002(a)(20). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(24). Acid Brook, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey. House §1002(a)(21). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(25). Canisteo River, Addison, New York. House §1002(a)(22). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(26). Cohocton River, Campbell, New York. House §1002(a)(23). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(27). Dry and Otter Creeks, Cortland, New York. House §1002(a)(24). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(28). East River, Silver Beach, New York City, New York. House §1002(a)(25). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(29). East Valley Creek, Andover, New York. House §1002(a)(26). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(30). Sunnyside Brook, Westchester County, New York. House §1002(a)(27). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(31). Little Yankee and Mud Run, Trumbull County, Ohio. House §1002(a)(28). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(32). Little Neshaminy Creek, Warrington, Pennsylvania. House §1002(a)(29). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(33). Southampton Creek Watershed, Southampton, Pennsylvania. House §1002(a)(30). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(34). Spring Creek, Lower Macungie Township, Pennsylvania. House §1002(a)(31). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(35). Yardley Aqueduct, Silver and Brock Creeks, Yardley, Pennsylvania. House §1002(a)(32). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(36). Surfside Beach, South Carolina. House §1002(a)(33). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(37). Sandy Creek, Jackson County, Tennessee. Senate §3113. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

1002(a)(38). Congelosi Ditch, Missouri City, Texas. House §1002(a)(34). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(39). Dilley, Texas. House §1002(a)(35). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1002(a)(40). Cheyenne, Wyoming. Senate §1004(7). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 1003. SMALL PROJECTS FOR EMERGENCY STREAMBANK PROTECTION

1003(1). Aliso Creek, California. House §1003(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(2). St. Johns Bluff Training Wall, Duval County, Florida. House §1003(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(3). Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Iberville Parish, Louisiana. House §1003(3). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(4). Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana. House §1003(4). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(5). Piney Point Lighthouse, St. Mary's County, Maryland. House §1003(5). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(6). Pug Hole Lake, Minnesota. House §1003(6). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(7). Middle Fork Grand River, Gentry County, Missouri. House §1003(7). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(8). Platte River, Platte City, Missouri. House §1003(8). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(9). Rush Creek, Parkville, Missouri. House §1003(9). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(10). Dry and Otter Creeks, Cortland County, New York. House §1003(10). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(11). Keuka Lake, Hammondsport, New York. House §1003(11). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(12). Kowawese Unique Area and Hudson River, New Windsor, New York. House §1003(12). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(13). Owego Creek, Tioga County, New York. House §1003(13). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(14). Howard Road Outfall, Shelby County, Tennessee. House §1003(14). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(15). Mitch Farm Ditch and Lateral D, Shelby County, Tennessee. House §1003(15). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(16). Wolf River Tributaries, Shelby County, Tennessee. House §1003(16). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(17). Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas. House §1003(17). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1003(18). Wells River, Newbury, Vermont. House §1003(18). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 1004. SMALL PROJECTS FOR NAVIGATION

1004(a)(1). Barrow Harbor, Alaska. Senate §1005(1). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(2). Coffman Cove, Alaska. House §5030. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

1004(a)(3). Kotzebue Harbor, Alaska. House §5033. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

1004(a)(4). Nome Harbor, Alaska. Senate §1005(2). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(5). Old Harbor, Alaska. Senate §1005(3). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(6). Little Rock Port, Arkansas. Senate §1005(4). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(7). Mississippi River Ship Channel, Louisiana. House §1004(a)(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1004(a)(8). East Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Sandwich, Massachusetts. House §1004(a)(2), Senate 1005(5).—Same.

1004(a)(9). Lynn Harbor, Lynn, Massachusetts. House §1004(a)(3), Senate §1005(6).—Same.

1004(a)(10). Merrimack River, Haverhill, Massachusetts. House §1004(a)(4), Senate §1005(7).—Same.

1004(a)(11). Oak Bluffs Harbor, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts. House §1004(a)(5), Senate §1005(8).—Same.

1004(a)(12). Woods Hole Great Harbor, Falmouth, Massachusetts. House §1004(a)(6), Senate §1005(9).—Same.

1004(a)(13). Au Sable River, Michigan. House §1004(a)(7), Senate §1005(10).—Same.

1004(a)(14). Clinton River, Michigan. Senate §1005(11). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(15). Ontonagon River, Michigan. Senate §1005(12). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(16). Outer Channel and Inner Harbor, Menominee Harbor, Michigan and Wisconsin. Senate §1005(16). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(17). Sebewaing River, Michigan. Senate §1005(14). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1004(a)(18). Traverse City Harbor, Traverse City, Michigan. House §1004(a)(8), Senate §1005(13).—Same.

1004(a)(19). Tower Harbor, Tower Minnesota. House §1004(a)(9), Senate §1005(15).—Same.

1004(a)(20). Olcott Harbor, Olcott, New York. House §1004(a)(10). No comparable House section.—Senate recedes.

1004(a)(21). Milwaukee Harbor, Wisconsin. Senate §1005(18). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 1005. SMALL PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

1005(1). Ballona Creek, Los Angeles County, California. House §1005(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1005(2). Ballona Lagoon Tide Gates, Marina Del Ray, California. House §1005(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1005(3). Ft. George Inlet, Duval County, Florida. House §1005(3). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1005(4). Rathbun Lake, Iowa. House §1005(4). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1005(5). Smithville Lake, Missouri. House §1005(5). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1005(6). Delaware Bay, New Jersey and Delaware. House §1005(6). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1005(7). Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania. House §1005(7). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 1006. SMALL PROJECTS FOR AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

1006(a)(1). Cypress Creek, Montgomery, Alabama. House §1006(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(2). Black Lake, Alaska. House §1006(2), Senate §1006(1).—Same.

1006(a)(3). Ben Lomond Dam, Santa Cruz, California. House §1006(4). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(4). Dockweiler Bluffs, Los Angeles County, California. House §1006(5). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(5). Salt River, California. House §1006(6). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(6). San Diego River, California. Senate §1006(2). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(7). Santa Rosa Creek, Santa Rosa, California. House §1006(7). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(8). Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel and Lower San Joaquin River, California. House §1006(8). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(9). Suisun Marsh, San Pablo Bay, California. Senate §1006(3). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(10). Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, California. House §1006(9). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(11). Biscayne Bay, Florida. House §1006(10). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(12). Clam Bayou and Dinkins Bayou, Sanibel Island, Florida. House §1006(11). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(13). Mountain Park, Georgia. Senate §2037(a)(2)(A). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(14). Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama. House §1006(12), Senate §1006(4).—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(15). Longwood Cove, Gainesville, Georgia. House §1006(13). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(16). City Park, University Lakes, Louisiana. House §1006(15). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(17). Lawrence Gateway, Massachusetts. Senate §1006(5). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(18). Milford Pond, Milford, Massachusetts. Senate §1006(7). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(19). Mill Pond, Littleton, Massachusetts. House §1006(16), Senate §1006(6).—Same.

1006(a)(20). Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts. House §1006(17), Senate §1006(8).—Same.

1006(a)(21). Clinton River, Michigan. Senate §1006(9). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(22). Kalamazoo River Watershed, Battle Creek, Michigan. House §1006(18). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(23). Rush Lake, Minnesota. House §1006(19). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(24). South Fork of the Crow River, Hutchinson, Minnesota. House §1006(20). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(25). St. Louis, Missouri. House §1006(21). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(26). Mobley Dam, Tongue River, Montana. No comparable House or Senate section.

1006(a)(27). S and H Dam, Tongue River, Montana. No comparable House or Senate section.

1006(a)(28). Vandalia Dam, Milk River, Montana. No comparable House or Senate section.

1006(a)(29). Truckee River, Reno, Nevada. House §1006(22). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(30). Grover's Mill Pond, New Jersey. House §1006(23). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(31). Caldwell County, North Carolina. Senate §1006(10). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(32). Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. Senate §1006(11). No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1006(a)(33). Dugway Creek, Bratenahl, Ohio. House §1006(24). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(34). Johnson Creek, Gresham, Oregon. House §1006(25), Senate §1006(12).—Same.

1006(a)(35). Beaver Creek, Beaver and Salem, Pennsylvania. House §1006(26). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(36). Cementon Dam, Lehigh River, Pennsylvania. House §1006(27). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(37). Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania. House §5003(a)(5), Senate §2037(a)(2)(E).—House recedes.

1006(a)(38). Saucon Creek, Northampton County, Pennsylvania. House §1006(28). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(39). Stillwater Lake Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania. Senate §2037(a)(2)(F), House §5003(a)(7).—House recedes.

1006(a)(40). Blackstone River, Rhode Island. House §1006(29), Senate §1006(13).—Same.

1006(a)(41). Wilson Branch, Cheraw, South Carolina. House §1006(30). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(42). White River, Bethel, Vermont. House §1006(31). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1006(a)(43). College Lake, Lynchburg, Virginia. Senate §1006(14). No comparable Senate section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 1007. SMALL PROJECTS FOR SHORELINE PROTECTION

1007(1). Nelson Lagoon, Alaska. House §1007(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1007(2). Nicholas Canyon, Los Angeles, California. Senate §4006. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

1007(3). Sanibel Island, Florida. House §1007(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1007(4). Apra Harbor, Guam. House §1007(3). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1007(5). Piti, Cabras Island, Guam. House §1007(4). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1007(6). Narrows and Gravesend Bay, Upper New York Bay, Brooklyn, New York. House §1007(5). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1007(7). Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pennsylvania. House §1007(7). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

1007(8). Port Aransas, Texas. House §1007(8). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 1008. SMALL PROJECTS FOR SNAGGING AND SEDIMENT REMOVAL

1008. Kowawese Unique Area and Hudson River, New Windsor, New York. House §1008. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 1009. SMALL PROJECTS TO PREVENT OR MITIGATE DAMAGE CAUSED BY NAVIGATION PROJECTS

1009(1). Tybee Island, Georgia. Senate §1007(1). House §4032. House recedes.

1009(2). Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana. Senate §1007(2). House §5069. House recedes.

#### SEC. 1010. SMALL PROJECTS FOR AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL

1010. Republican River Basin, Nebraska. Senate §1008. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

### TITLE 2—GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### SEC. 2001. NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

House §2001. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2002. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS

House §2003, Senate §2017. Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The Managers recognize the importance of efficient and effective processing of permits by the Corps of Engineers for activities affecting federally regulated waters, including wetlands, in compliance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et. seq.). Congress included a provision in the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-541, Sec. 214) to expedite the permit processing time for nonfederal public entities.

The Managers also recognize the findings and recommendations of the May 2007 report of the United States Government Accountability Office (“GAO”), entitled “Corps of

Engineers Needs to Ensure That Permit Decisions Made Using Funds from Nonfederal Public Entities Are Transparent and Impartial” (GAO-07-478). In this report, GAO emphasized the importance of transparency and impartiality in permit reviews and decision-making, and ensuring that all of the Corps’ District offices follow internal Corps’ Headquarters guidance on maintaining impartial decisionmaking, including, at a minimum, that all Corps District offices provide that permits decisions under section 214 are reviewed at least by one level above the decisionmaker, that all final permit decisions are made available electronically, that the Corps not eliminate any procedures or decisions that would otherwise be required for the type of project under consideration, and that the Corps comply with all applicable laws and regulations. The GAO report also expressed concern that certain Corps districts have allowed private companies to submit permit applications under section 214, in contravention to the intent of this authority.

Although GAO was not able to conclude definitively whether permitting processing times have decreased under the section 214 program, the report does recognize some benefits reported by participating non-Federal public entities, including the potential for reduced cost and time for permit processing for those entities that have contributed funds to the program, and improved communication between participating entities and the Corps.

The Managers intend to conduct additional oversight on the implementation of this program before the authority for this program expires in 2009.

#### SEC. 2003. WRITTEN AGREEMENT FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

House §2009, Senate §2001, 2023, and 2039.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2004. COMPILATION OF LAWS

House §2011, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2005. DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL

House §2012, Senate §3089.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2006. REMOTE AND SUBSISTENCE HARBORS

House §2015, Senate §2038.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2007. USE OF OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS

House §2018, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2008. REVISION OF PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT; COST SHARING

House §2019, 2020, 2035. No comparable Senate sections.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2009. EXPEDITED ACTIONS FOR EMERGENCY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION

House §2021, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2010. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS

House §2022, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2011. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

House §2023, Senate §2027.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2012. WILDFIRE FIREFIGHTING

House §2024, Senate §2022.—Same.

#### SEC. 2013. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

House §2025, Senate §2009.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2014. LAKES PROGRAM

House §2026, Senate §5001.—House and Senate with comparable sections, combine list of House and Senate projects.

This section amends section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to add the following locations to the Lakes Pro-

gram: Kinkaid Lake, Jackson County, Illinois; McCarter Pond, Borough of Fairhaven, New Jersey; Rogers Pond, Franklin Township, New Jersey; Greenwood Lake, New York and New Jersey; Lake Rodgers, Creedmoor, North Carolina; Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota; Lake Luxembourg, Pennsylvania; Lake Fairlee, Vermont; and Lake Morley, Vermont.

#### SEC. 2015. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

House §2029, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2016. TRAINING FUNDS

House §2030, Senate §2003.—Same.

#### SEC. 2017. ACCESS TO WATER RESOURCE DATA

House §2031, Senate §2010.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2018. SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS

House §2032, Senate §2014.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2019. ABILITY TO PAY

House §2033, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2020. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM AND ESTUARY RESTORATION

House §2006, Senate §2033, 2035, and 2037.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The Managers recognize the importance of projects for the restoration of salt-water estuaries and for the rehabilitation and removal of dams in improving aquatic ecosystems and the environment. The Managers recognize that such projects are typically eligible under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

This section amends section 206 to explicitly authorize projects that improve elements and features of an estuary (as defined in section 103 of the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2902)) and projects for the removal of dams, that otherwise meet the requirements of section 206.

#### SEC. 2021. SMALL FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS

House §2007, Senate §2040.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2022. SMALL RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Senate §2031, No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2023. PROTECTION OF HIGHWAYS, BRIDGE APPROACHES, PUBLIC WORKS, AND NONPROFIT PUBLIC SERVICES

Senate §2032, No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2024. MODIFICATION OF PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

House §2008, Senate §2034.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2025. REMEDIATION OF ABANDONED MINE SITES

Senate §2036, No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Clean-up project in Contra Costa County, California.

#### SEC. 2026. LEASING AUTHORITY

House §2034, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2027. FISCAL TRANSPARENCY REPORT

Senate §2004, No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2028. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM

House §2041, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2029. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CRITERIA FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF HARBOR DREDGING PROJECTS

House §2043, No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2030. INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT AUTHORITY

Senate §2002, No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 2028. WATER RESOURCES PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES

House §2036, Senate §2006.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2032. WATER RESOURCE PRIORITIES REPORT

Senate §2006(d), No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 2033. PLANNING

Senate §2005, No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2034. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW

Senate §2007, House §2037.—House recedes, with an amendment.

Section 2034 provides that project studies shall be subject to peer review by an independent panel of experts, as provided in this section. The conference agreement is a combination of independent peer review proposals passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives. The managers believe that the conference agreement improves upon both the House and Senate proposals to create a strong, workable, and independent process for review of project studies carried out by the Corps of Engineers. For example, the conference agreement authorizes the independent peer review to run concurrent with the project study period, and requires that the peer review panel remain beyond the release of the independent peer review report to allow the expertise gained during the review period to be utilized by the Corps up to the release of the draft report of the Chief of Engineers.

This section establishes two categories for independent peer review—project studies for which independent peer review is mandatory, and project studies for which such review is discretionary. This section provides for mandatory review of project studies that have an estimated total cost of more than \$45 million, project studies for which the Governor of an affected state requests an independent peer review, and project studies that the Chief of Engineers determines are controversial. In determining whether a project is controversial, the Chief of Engineers must consider whether there is significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the proposed project, and whether there is significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the proposed project.

Section 2034(a)(3)(B) provides for discretionary independent peer review of project studies for which the head of a Federal or state agency charged with reviewing the project study determines that the proposed project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on environmental, cultural, or other natural resources under the jurisdiction of the agency after implementation of the proposed mitigation plans. This section provides that the Chief of Engineers must reach a decision whether to conduct an independent peer review of such project studies within 21 days of a receipt of a request by the head of the Federal or state agency. In the event that the Chief of Engineers decides not to conduct a discretionary independent peer review, the head of the Federal or state agency that requested the review may appeal this decision to the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”). The Chairman of CEQ must reach a decision on whether an independent peer review must be conducted for the project study within 30 days of receipt of an appeal. In the event that the Chief of Engineers decides not to conduct an independent peer review, the Chief of Engineers must make the reasons for not conducting the review publicly available, including on the Internet.



Section 2034 permits the Chief of Engineers to exclude a very limited number of project studies from independent peer review. The managers expect that project studies that could be excluded from independent peer review are so limited in scope or impact, that they would not significantly benefit from an independent peer review.

Sections 2034(a)(5)(A) and (B) establish criteria for the Chief of Engineers to exclude a project study that is subject to independent peer review because its estimated total costs exceed \$45 million. The managers expect that these criteria allow the Chief of Engineers to exclude from independent peer review only those project studies for which there is no controversy, a lack of significant impact to cultural, historical, or tribal resources, a lack of substantial adverse impacts to fish and wildlife species or habitat, and a lack of an impact on endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, or involve projects that, in essence, replace existing components of ongoing projects within the same footprint as the original project, or have minimal risk to life or public safety.

Project studies subject to independent peer review based on the request of the Governor of an affected State may not be excluded from review.

Section 2034(a)(5)(C) authorizes the Chief of Engineers to exclude the small project studies developed under certain of the Corps of Engineers continuing authorities programs; however, such project studies could be subject to independent peer review under the factors established under section 2034(a)(3)(A).

Sections 2034(a)(2) and 2034(d) establish the duties of the independent peer review panel and the scope of review for a project study. The managers have defined the scope of review broadly to allow the independent review panel to examine all of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analyses, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in evaluation of economic or environmental impacts of proposed projects, and any biological opinions of the project study. The managers expect the independent peer review panel to review those components of a project study for which the panel believes there is a reason for review. The managers do not expect the independent peer review panel to review components of the project study where the panel determines there is no controversy, disagreement, or concern.

Sections 2034(b) and 2034(e)(1)(A) establish the timing of the independent peer review. The managers expect that, in all cases, the independent peer review will occur during the period beginning on the date of the signing of the feasibility cost-sharing agreement, and will be conducted concurrent with the development of the project study by the Corps of Engineers. The managers believe that having the independent peer review carried out concurrently with the development of the project study will allow the independent peer review panel to receive relevant information from the Corps, on a timely basis, and allow the independent peer review panel to provide ongoing input into the development of the project study. The managers expect that this process will provide the independent peer review panel with sufficient information to conduct its review, as well as allow the peer review panel to recommend mid-course corrections to the ongoing project study, and avoid the potential for significant issues or delay to arise at the end of the project study period. The managers recognize that the recommendations of the independent peer review panel are advisory;

however, the managers expect the Corps to give full consideration to the findings of the independent peer review panel.

Section 2034(e)(1)(A) provides that the independent peer review panel conclude its peer review, and submit a report to the Chief of Engineers, not more than 60 days after the close of the public comment period for the draft project study. The Chief of Engineers may extend the period for the peer review panel to conclude its peer review if the Chief of Engineers determines that additional time is necessary. The managers have included language to terminate the peer review panel on the date of the initiation of the State and agency review, which is conterminous with the release of the draft Report of the Chief of Engineers for the project, and which is after the issuance of the peer review report. The managers recognize that the Corps of Engineers intends to allow a member or members of the peer review panel to participate on the Civil Works Review Board, which requires District Commanders to present their final reports and recommendations for review. The managers have included language to keep the independent peer review impaneled beyond the issuance of the peer review report to allow a member of the peer review panel to participate on the Civil Works Review Board, and to be available as experts, if needed, for additional consultation with the Corps of Engineers on the project study.

#### SEC. 2035. SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW

Senate §2007(d). No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2036. MITIGATION FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE AND WETLANDS LOSSES

House §2013 and 2014, Senate §2008.—House recedes, with an amendment.

Section 2036 amends section 906(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 with more explicit mitigation requirements and to specify the elements that must be identified in a mitigation plan required under that section.

This section requires the Secretary to mitigate losses to flood damage reduction capabilities and losses to fish and wildlife of the project area. The specific mitigation plan must include a description of the physical action to be undertaken. The plan also must include a description of the lands or interests in lands to be acquired for mitigation, and the basis for a determination that such lands are available. This description is not intended to be a description of the specific property interests, but the plan must describe how the mitigation will be implemented.

The managers expect the mitigation plan to identify the quantity and type of lands needed, and include a determination that lands of such quantity and type are available for acquisition. The plan also must include the type, amount, and characteristics of the habitat to be restored. The plan must include success criteria based on replacement of lost functions and values of the habitat, including hydrologic and vegetative characteristics. Finally, if monitoring is necessary to determine success of the mitigation, the plan must include a plan for monitoring and to the extent practicable, identification of the entities responsible for monitoring. As monitoring is part of operation and maintenance of a project, in most cases the entity responsible for any monitoring will be the non-Federal sponsor. If such person is not identifiable at the time the mitigation plan is prepared under this section, such person must be identified in the partnership agreement entered into with the non-Federal interest.

The managers support more specificity in Corps reporting documents concerning expected mitigation efforts. Such increased

specificity will better inform the Congress, the non-Federal sponsor, and the public as to planned mitigation efforts and the likely success of these efforts. This section also directs the Secretary to submit to Congress a report on the status of mitigation concurrent with the submission of reports on the status of project construction, as part of the President's budget submission.

Section 2036(c) directs the Secretary, when carrying out water resources projects, to first consider the use of a mitigation bank if the bank has sufficient and appropriate (including ecologically appropriate) credit to offset the impact, and the mitigation bank meets certain criteria. To the maximum extent practicable, the service area of the mitigation bank shall be in the same watershed as the project activity for which mitigation is required.

Nothing in this section affects the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers to apply the regulatory guidelines developed under section 404(b)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (40 CFR Part 230) related to mitigation sequencing.

#### SEC. 2037. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT

House §2016, Senate §2012.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

This section amends section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326), and includes a new subsection (f) that directs the Secretary to give priority to regional sediment management projects in the following locations: Little Rock Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas; Fletcher Cove, California; Egmont Key, Florida; Calcasieu Ship Channel, Louisiana; Delaware River Estuary, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; Fire Island Inlet, Suffolk County, New York; Smith Point Park Pavilion and the TWA Flight 800 Memorial, Brookhaven, New York; Morehead City, North Carolina; Toledo Harbor, Lucas County, Ohio; Galveston Bay, Texas; and Benson Beach, Washington.

#### SEC. 2038. NATIONAL SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

House §2005 and 2004, Senate §2013.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2039. MONITORING ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Senate §2015. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2040. ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS

Senate §2018. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 2041. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

Senate §2024. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 2042. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Senate §2025. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 2043. STUDIES AND REPORTS FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

House §2038. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 2044. COORDINATION AND SCHEDULING OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ACTIONS

House §2027. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2045. PROJECT STREAMLINING

House §2028. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2046. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATION

Senate §2028, House §3123(f).—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 2047. FEDERAL HOPPER DREDGES

House §2042, Senate §2020.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

##### SEC. 3001. BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, ALABAMA

Senate §3003. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3002. COOK INLET, ALASKA

House §3001. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3003. KING COVE HARBOR, ALASKA

House §3002. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3004. SEWARD HARBOR, ALASKA

Senate §4001. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3005. SITKA, ALASKA

House §3003, Senate §3002.—Same.

## SEC. 3006. TATITILEK, ALASKA

House §3004. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3007. RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA

House §3005, Senate §3005.—Same.

## SEC. 3008. NOGALES WASH AND TRIBUTARIES

## FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, ARIZONA

Senate §3004. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3009. TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, ARIZONA

Senate §3006. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3010. OSCEOLA HARBOR, ARKANSAS

House §3006. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3011. ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, ARKANSAS AND MISSOURI

Senate §3010. House §5043.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3012. PINE MOUNTAIN DAM, ARKANSAS

House §3007. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3013. RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN LEVEES, ARKANSAS AND LOUISIANA

Senate §3009. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3014. CACHE CREEK BASIN, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3013. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3015. CALFED STABILITY PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3014. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3016. COMPTON CREEK, CALIFORNIA

House §3009. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3017. GRAYSON CREEK/MURDERER'S CREEK, CALIFORNIA

House §3010, Senate §2016(1).—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3018. HAMILTON AIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA

House §3011, Senate §3015.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3019. JOHN F. BALDWIN SHIP CHANNEL AND STOCKTON SHIP CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA

House §3012. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

The managers recommend that the Secretary and the Chief of Engineers expedite the completion of the ongoing General Reevaluation Report for the San Francisco Bay to Stockton project.

## SEC. 3020. KAWEAH RIVER, CALIFORNIA

House §3013. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3021. LARKSPUR FERRY CHANNEL, LARKSPUR, CALIFORNIA

House §3014, Senate §3017.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3022. LLAGAS CREEK, CALIFORNIA

House §3015, Senate §3018.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3023. MAGPIE CREEK, CALIFORNIA

House §3016, Senate §3019.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3024. PACIFIC FLYWAY CENTER, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

House §3017. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3025. PETALUMA RIVER, PETALUMA, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3020. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3026. PINOLE CREEK, CALIFORNIA

House §3018. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3027. PRADO DAM, CALIFORNIA

House §3019. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3028. REDWOOD CITY NAVIGATION CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3029. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

The managers recognize the importance of annual operation and maintenance of navigation channels and note that the work addressed in this section can be addressed under existing statutory authorities. The managers do not intend to address the operation and maintenance of every navigation project through the enactment of additional statutory language, but expect the Corps to address the maintenance dredging needs of authorized projects under existing statutory authorities.

## SEC. 3029. SACRAMENTO AND AMERICAN RIVERS FLOOD CONTROL, CALIFORNIA

House §3008 and 3020, Senate §3023.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3030. SACRAMENTO DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA

House §3019. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3031. SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3024. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3032. SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3026. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3033. SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CALIFORNIA

No comparable Senate or House section.

## SEC. 3034. SANTA BARBARA STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3027. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3035. SANTA CRUZ HARBOR, CALIFORNIA

House §3022. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3036. SEVEN OAKS DAM, CALIFORNIA

House §3023, Senate §2016(2).—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3037. UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CALIFORNIA

House §3025, Senate §3028.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3038. WALNUT CREEK CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA

House §3025, Senate §2016(3).—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3039. WILDCAT/SAN PABLO CREEK PHASE I, CALIFORNIA

House §3026. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3040. WILDCAT/SAN PABLO CREEK PHASE II, CALIFORNIA

House §3027, Senate §2016(5).—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3041. YUBA RIVER BASIN PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

House §3028, Senate §3029.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3042. SOUTH PLATTE RIVER BASIN, COLORADO

House §3029. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3043. INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DELAWARE AND MARYLAND

House §3030. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3044. ST. GEORGE'S BRIDGE, DELAWARE

Senate §3033. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3045. BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

House §3031, Senate §3035.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3046. BROWARD COUNTY AND HILLSBORO INLET, FLORIDA

House §3032. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3047. CANAVERAL HARBOR, FLORIDA

House §3033. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3048. GASPARILLA AND ESTERO ISLANDS, FLORIDA

House §3034. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3049. LIDO KEY BEACH, SARASOTA, FLORIDA

House §3036, Senate §3038.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3050. PEANUT ISLAND, FLORIDA

House §3038. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3051. PORT SUTTON, FLORIDA

Senate §3039. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3052. TAMPA HARBOR-BIG BEND CHANNEL, FLORIDA

House §3039. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3053. TAMPA HARBOR CUT B, FLORIDA

House §3040, Senate §3040.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3054. ALLATOONA LAKE, GEORGIA

House §3041, Senate §3041.—House recedes.

## SEC. 3055. LATHAM RIVER, GLYNN COUNTY, GEORGIA

House §3042. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3056. DWORSHAK RESERVOIR IMPROVEMENTS, IDAHO

Senate §3042, House §3043.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3057. LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, IDAHO

Senate §3043. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3058. BEARDSTOWN COMMUNITY BOAT HARBOR, BEARDSTOWN, ILLINOIS

House §3044. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3059. CACHE RIVER LEVEE, ILLINOIS

House §3045, Senate §3045.—Same.

## SEC. 3060. CHICAGO RIVER, ILLINOIS

House §3046, Senate §3046.—Same.

## SEC. 3061. CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIERS PROJECT, ILLINOIS

House §3047, Senate §5015.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3062. EMIQUON, ILLINOIS

House §3048. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3063. LASALLE, ILLINOIS

House §3049. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3064. SPUNKY BOTTOMS, ILLINOIS

House §3050, Senate §3050.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 3065. CEDAR LAKE, INDIANA

No comparable House or Senate section.

## SEC. 3066. KOONTZ LAKE, INDIANA

House §3052. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 3067. WHITE RIVER, INDIANA

House §3053. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront

development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 3068. DES MOINES RIVER AND GREENBELT, IOWA

House §3054. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 3069. PERRY CREEK, IOWA

Senate §3145. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3070. RATHBUN LAKE, IOWA

House §3055, Senate §3146.—Same.

SEC. 3071. HICKMAN BLUFF STABILIZATION, KENTUCKY

Senate §3054. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3072. MCALPINE LOCK AND DAM, KENTUCKY AND INDIANA

Senate §3055. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3073. PRESTONSBURG, KENTUCKY

House §3056. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3074. AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH WATERSHED

House §3057, Senate §3059.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3075. ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LOUISIANA

House §3059 and §3062, Senate §3056.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3076. ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, REGIONAL VISITOR CENTER, LOUISIANA

House §3058, Senate §3057.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3077. ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF, AND BLACK, LOUISIANA

No comparable House or Senate section.

SEC. 3078. BAYOU PLAQUEMINE, LOUISIANA

House §3056. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3079. CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LOUISIANA

Senate §3058. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3080. RED RIVER (J. BENNETT JOHNSTON) WATERWAY, LOUISIANA

House §3061, Senate §3061.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3081. MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LOUISIANA

House §3063. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3082. MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET RELOCATION ASSISTANCE, LOUISIANA

Senate §3060. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3083. VIOLET, LOUISIANA

Senate §3076. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3084. WEST BANK OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER (EAST OF HARVEY CANAL), LOUISIANA

House §3065. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3085. CAMP ELLIS, SACO, MAINE

House §3066, Senate §3062.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3086. CUMBERLAND, MARYLAND

Senate §3069. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3087. POPLAR ISLAND, MARYLAND

Senate §1001(22). No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3088. DETROIT RIVER SHORELINE, DETROIT, MICHIGAN

House §3067. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3089. ST. CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST. CLAIR, MICHIGAN

House §3067, Senate §3074.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3090. ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MICHIGAN

House §3065. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3091. SAULT SAINTE MARIE, MICHIGAN

House §3070. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

The Managers recognize the importance of constructing a second lock at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, to enhance overall national security by avoiding any potential disruption to Great Lakes, national, and international shipping that would occur in the event of a shutdown or terrorist attack at the existing lock. The Secretary is directed to carry out the project, as expeditiously as practicable, without regard to normal policy considerations.

SEC. 3092. ADA, MINNESOTA

House §3071. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3093. DULUTH HARBOR, MCQUADE ROAD, MINNESOTA

House §3072, Senate §3075.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3094. GRAND MARAIS, MINNESOTA

House §3073. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3095. GRAND PORTAGE HARBOR, MINNESOTA

House §3074. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3096. GRANITE FALLS, MINNESOTA

House §3073. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3097. KNIFE RIVER HARBOR, MINNESOTA

House §3076. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3098. RED LAKE RIVER, MINNESOTA

House §3077. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3099. SILVER BAY, MINNESOTA

House §3078. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3100. TACONITE HARBOR, MINNESOTA

House §3079. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3101. TWO HARBORS, MINNESOTA

House §3078. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3102. DEER ISLAND, HARRISON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

House §3078. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3103. JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

Senate §3147. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3104. PEARL RIVER BASIN, MISSISSIPPI

House §3082. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3105. FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MISSOURI

House §3083. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3106. L-15 LEVEE, MISSOURI

House §3084, Senate §3078.—Same.

SEC. 3107. MONARCH-CHESTERFIELD, MISSOURI

House §3085. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3108. RIVER DES PERES, MISSOURI

House §3086. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3109. LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT, MONTANA

Senate §3080. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3110. YELLOWSTONE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MONTANA AND NORTH DAKOTA

Senate §3081. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3111. ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

House §3087. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3112. SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NEBRASKA

House §3088. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3113. WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NEBRASKA

House §3089, Senate §3082.—Same.

SEC. 3114. LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, MCCARRAN RANCH, NEVADA

Senate §3083. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3115. LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NEW JERSEY

House §3090. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3116. PASSAIC RIVER BASIN FLOOD MANAGEMENT, NEW JERSEY

House §3091. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3117. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, NEW MEXICO

Senate §3084. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3118. MIDDLE RIO GRANDE RESTORATION, NEW MEXICO

Senate §3085. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3119. BUFFALO HARBOR, NEW YORK.

House §3092. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3120. LONG ISLAND SOUND OYSTER RESTORATION, NEW YORK AND CONNECTICUT

Senate §3086. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

The Managers recognize that oyster restoration activities are consistent with the

Corps environmental protection and restoration mission, and are appropriately cost shared at a non-Federal cost of 35 percent, consistent with section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213). This section does not create a new cost share for oyster restoration activities.

SEC. 3121. MAMARONECK AND SHELDRAKE RIVERS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, NEW YORK

Senate §3087. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 3122. ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NEW YORK  
House §3093, Senate §3088.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3123. PORT OF NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY

House §3094. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3124. NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM  
House §3095, Senate §3090.—Same.

SEC. 3125. SUSQUEHANNA RIVER AND UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, NEW YORK

Senate §3091. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3126. MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, NORTH DAKOTA

Senate §3092. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3127. WAHPETON, NORTH DAKOTA  
No comparable Senate or House section.

SEC. 3128. OHIO  
Senate §3093. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3129. LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, GIRARD, OHIO

House §3096, Senate §3094.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3130. MAHONING RIVER, OHIO

House §3074. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3131. ARCADIA LAKE, OKLAHOMA

Senate §3096. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3132. ARKANSAS RIVER CORRIDOR, OKLAHOMA

Senate §3012. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3133. LAKE EUFAULA, OKLAHOMA  
Senate §3097. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3134. OKLAHOMA LAKES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM, OKLAHOMA

Senate §3099. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3135. OTTAWA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

Senate §3100. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

Section 3135 provides general authorization to complete the current buyout of residences and businesses in the communities of Picher, Cardin, and Hockerville, Oklahoma for those applicants that wish to participate in the program being administered by the State of Oklahoma. The funds authorized in this section may be appropriated through any Act of appropriation.

Section 3135 directs the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to consider a remedial action for the Tar Creek, Oklahoma, National Priorities List site that includes permanent relocation of residents consistent with the program and costs of the program being administered by the State of Oklahoma. The Administrator should make appropriate use of the expertise and experience of the State of Oklahoma Lead-Impacted Communities Relocation Assistance Trust in developing such a remedy.

Section 3135 also provides that the inclusion of subsidence remedies, such as relocation, as part of the remedial action does not preempt or in any way delay or interfere with the right of any sovereign entity, including any state or tribal government, to utilize state laws to seek additional or other remedies, such as abatement, for the land subsidence and subsidence risks. This section does not supersede state or tribal authority to seek remedies for land subsidence.

SEC. 3136. RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL, OKLAHOMA AND TEXAS

Senate §3101. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3137. WAURIKA LAKE, OKLAHOMA

Senate §3102. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3138. UPPER WILLAMETTE RIVER WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OREGON  
Senate §3104. House §5103.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3139. DELAWARE RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA, NEW JERSEY, AND DELAWARE

House §3098. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3140. RAYSTOWN LAKE, PENNSYLVANIA

House §3099. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3141. SHERADEN PARK STREAM AND CHARTIERS CREEK, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

House §3100. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3142. SOLOMON'S CREEK, WILKES-BARRE, PENNSYLVANIA

House §3101. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3143. SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA

House §3102. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3144. WYOMING VALLEY, PENNSYLVANIA

House §3103. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3145. NARRAGANSETT BAY, RHODE ISLAND

Senate §3106. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3146. MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION, SOUTH DAKOTA

Senate §3108. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3147. CEDAR BAYOU, TEXAS

House §3104, Senate §3113.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3148. FREEPORT HARBOR, TEXAS.

House §3105, Senate §3116.—House recedes.

SEC. 3149. LAKE KEMP, TEXAS

House §3106. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3150. LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TEXAS

House §3107. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3151. NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TEXAS

House §3108. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3152. PAT MAYSE LAKE, TEXAS

House §3109. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

The managers recognize the need to review Federal policy concerning water supply at Corps of Engineers reservoirs, and to determine whether changes are warranted. At many existing Corps of Engineers reservoirs, there is the possibility of expanding the storage space that is dedicated to municipal and industrial water supply (drinking water) as an alternative to alleviate local water supply shortages. This is particularly true throughout the Southwest and Southeast. The current policy of the Corps of Engineers is to maximize the return to the Treasury for the right to utilize storage at these existing reservoirs. This often makes the cost of storage too high for many communities.

The managers have included section 3152 in the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 to address this issue at Pat Mayse Lake, Texas; however, the managers do not expect to address additional water supply agreements on a case-by-case basis in future water resources bills, but rather to review the overall Federal policy concerning the operation of Corps of Engineers facilities.

SEC. 3153. PROCTOR LAKE, TEXAS

House §3110. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3154. SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

House §3111. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3155. CONNECTICUT RIVER RESTORATION, VERMONT

Senate §3118. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3156. DAM REMEDIATION, VERMONT

Senate §3118. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

This provision adds the following dams to section 543 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000: Camp Wapanacki, Hardwick; Star Lake Dam, Mt. Holly; Curtis Pond, Calais; Weathersfield Reservoir, Springfield; Burr Pond, Sudbury; Maidstone Lake, Guildhall; Upper and Lower Hurricane Dam; Lake Fairlee; West Charleston Dam; White River, Sharon.

SEC. 3157. LAKE CHAMPLAIN EURASIAN MILFOIL, WATER CHESTNUT, AND OTHER NONNATIVE PLANT CONTROL, VERMONT

Senate §3120. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3158. UPPER CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN WETLAND RESTORATION, VERMONT AND NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senate §3121. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3159. UPPER CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, VERMONT AND NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senate §3122. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3160. LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED, VERMONT AND NEW YORK

Senate §3123. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3161. SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA

Senate §3148. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3162. TANGIER ISLAND SEAWALL, VIRGINIA

House §3112, Senate §3126.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3163. DUWANISH/GREEN, WASHINGTON

House §3113. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3164. MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, MCNARY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO

Senate §3128. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3165. SNAKE RIVER PROJECT, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO

Senate §3130. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3166. YAKIMA RIVER, PORT OF SUNNYSIDE, WASHINGTON

House §3114. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3167. BLUESTONE LAKE, OHIO RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA

House §3115. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3168. GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA

House §3116. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3169. LESAGE/GREENBOTTOM SWAMP, WEST VIRGINIA

House §3117. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3170. LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WEST VIRGINIA

Senate §3132. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3171. MCDOWELL COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA

Senate §3133. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3172. PARKERSBURG, WEST VIRGINIA

House §3118. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 3173. GREEN BAY HARBOR, GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN

Senate §3134. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3174. MANITOWOC HARBOR, WISCONSIN

House §3119. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3175. MISSISSIPPI RIVER HEADWATERS RESERVOIRS

House §3120, Senate §3137.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 3176. UPPER BASIN OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

Senate §3140. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 3177. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Senate §3139. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 3178. UPPER OHIO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES NAVIGATION SYSTEM NEW TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROGRAM

Senate §3144. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 3179. CONTINUATION OF PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

(1) Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, California. House §3121(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(2) Agana River, Guam. House §3121(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(3) Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland and Virginia. House §3121(3), Senate §3067. Senate recedes.

(4) Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts. House §3121(4), Senate §3071.—Senate recedes.

(5) Ecorse Creek, Wayne County, Michigan. Senate §3073. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 3180. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS

(1) Menominee Harbor and River, Michigan and Wisconsin. House §3122(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(2) Hearing Island Inlet, Duluth Harbor, Minnesota. House §3122(3). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(3) Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin. House §3122(2), Senate §3135.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 3181. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS

(a)(1) Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut. House §3123(a)(1), Senate §6003.—Senate recedes.

(a)(2) Mystic River, Connecticut. House §3123(a)(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(a)(3) Norwalk Harbor, Connecticut. Senate §3031. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(a)(4) Rockland Harbor, Maine. House §3123(a)(4), Senate §3036.—House recedes.

(a)(5) Rockport Harbor, Maine. Senate §3064. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(a)(6) Falmouth Harbor, Massachusetts. House §3123(a)(5), Senate §6027.—Senate recedes.

(a)(7) Island End River, Massachusetts. House §3123(a)(5), Senate §6028.—Senate recedes.

(a)(8) City Waterway, Tacoma, Washington. House §3123(a)(7). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(a)(9) Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts. House §3123(a)(8), Senate §3070.—Senate recedes.

(a)(10) Whatcom Creek Waterway, Bellingham, Washington. Senate §3131. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(a)(11) Oconto Harbor, Wisconsin. Senate §3136. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(b) Anchorage Area, New London Harbor, Connecticut. Senate §3031, House §3142(a)(3).—House recedes.

(c) Southport Harbor, Fairfield, Connecticut. House §3123(b). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(d) Saco River, Maine. House §3123(c), Senate §3065.—Same.

(e) Union River, Maine. House §3123(d), Senate §3066.—Senate recedes.

(f) Mystic River, Massachusetts. House §3123(e), Senate §6029.—Senate recedes.

(g) Rivercenter, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. No comparable House or Senate section.

(h) Additional Deauthorizations. Senate §§6002, 6004, 6005, 6007, 6008, 6009, 6011, 6013, 6014, 6015, 6016, 6017, 6018, 6019, 6022, 6023, 6026, 6033, 6034, 6036, 6037, 6042, 6045, 6046, 6048, 6049, 6050, 6051, 6052, 6053, and 6055. No comparable House sections.—House recedes.

#### SEC. 3182. LAND CONVEYANCES

(a) St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri. House §3124(a), Senate §3011.—Senate recedes.

(b) Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, California. Senate §5006. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(c) Milford, Kansas. House §3124(b), Senate §3052.—Senate recedes.

(d) Strawn Cemetery, John Redmond Lake, Kansas. Senate §3051. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(e) Pike County, Missouri. House §3124(c), Senate §3077.—House recedes.

(f) Union Lake, Missouri. Senate §3079. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(g) Boardman, Oregon. House §3124(d). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

(h) Lookout Point Project, Lowell, Oregon. House §3124(e), Senate §3103. Senate recedes, with an amendment.

(i) Richard B. Russell Lake, South Carolina. House §3124(g), Senate §3107.—House recedes, with an amendment.

(j) Denison, Texas. House §3124(h), Senate §3114.—House recedes, with an amendment.

(k) Generally Applicable Provisions. House §3124(i). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 3183. EXTINGUISHMENT OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS AND USE RESTRICTIONS

(a) Idaho. House §3125(a), Senate §3044.—House recedes.

(b) Lake Texoma, Oklahoma. House §3125(b), Senate §3098. House recedes, with an amendment.

(c) Lowell, Oregon. House §3124(f). No comparable Senate provision.—Senate recedes.

(d) Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee. House §3125(c), Senate §3111.—House recedes.

(e) Lower Granite Pool, Washington. Senate §3128. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

(f) Port of Pasco, Washington. House §3125(d). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### TITLE IV—STUDIES

##### SEC. 4001. JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM

House §4001. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4002. LAKE ERIE DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITES

House §4002. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4003. SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES DROUGHT STUDY

House §4003. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4004. DELAWARE RIVER

House §4004. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4005. EURASIAN MILFOIL

Senate §4031. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

##### SEC. 4006. FIRE ISLAND, ALASKA

House §5031. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

##### SEC. 4007. KNIK ARM, COOK INLET, ALASKA

House §4005. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4008. KUSKOKWIM RIVER, ALASKA

House §4006. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4009. NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, ALASKA

Senate §4002. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

##### SEC. 4010. ST. GEORGE HARBOR, ALASKA

House §4007. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4011. SUSITNA RIVER, ALASKA

House §4008. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

##### SEC. 4012. VALDEZ, ALASKA

House §5037. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

- SEC. 4013. GILA BEND, MARICOPA, ARIZONA  
House §4009. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4014. SEARCY COUNTY, ARKANSAS  
House §4010. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4015. ALISO CREEK, CALIFORNIA  
House §4011. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4016. FRESNO, KINGS, AND KERN COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA  
House §4013. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4017. FRUITVALE AVENUE RAILROAD BRIDGE, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA  
Senate §4004. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4018. LOS ANGELES RIVER REVITALIZATION STUDY, CALIFORNIA  
House §4014, Senate §4005.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4019. LYTLE CREEK, RIALTO, CALIFORNIA  
House §4015. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4020. MOKELUMNE RIVER, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
House §4016. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4021. ORICK, CALIFORNIA  
House §4018. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4022. SHORELINE STUDY, OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA  
Senate §4007. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4023. RIALTO, FONTANA, AND COLTON, CALIFORNIA  
House §4019. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4024. SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIFORNIA  
House §4020. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4025. SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
House §4021. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4026. SAN FRANCISCO BAY, SACRAMENTO—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CALIFORNIA  
House §4022, Senate §4009.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4027. SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE, CALIFORNIA  
House §4023, Senate §4010.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4028. TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA  
House §4024. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.
- SEC. 4029. YUCCA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
House §4025. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.
- SEC. 4030. SELENIUM STUDY, COLORADO  
Senate §4013. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.
- SEC. 4031. DELAWARE AND CHRISTINA RIVERS AND SHELLPOT CREEK, WILMINGTON, DELAWARE  
House §4027. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4032. DELAWARE INLAND BAYS AND TRIBUTARIES AND ATLANTIC COAST, DELAWARE  
Senate §4014. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4033. COLLIER COUNTY BEACHES, FLORIDA  
House §4028. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4034. LOWER ST. JOHNS RIVER, FLORIDA  
House §4029. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.
- SEC. 4035. HERBERT HOOVER DIKE SUPPLEMENTAL MAJOR REHABILITATION REPORT, FLORIDA  
Senate §4015. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4036. VANDERBILT BEACH LAGOON, FLORIDA  
House §4030. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4037. MERIWETHER COUNTY, GEORGIA  
House §4031. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4038. BOISE RIVER, IDAHO  
House §4033, Senate §4016.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4039. BALLARD'S ISLAND SIDE CHANNEL, ILLINOIS  
House §4034. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4040. CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
Senate §3046. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4041. SALEM, INDIANA  
House §4035. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4042. BUCKHORN LAKE, KENTUCKY  
House §4036. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4043. DEWEY LAKE, KENTUCKY  
House §4037. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4044. LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY  
House §4038. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4045. VIDALIA PORT, LOUISIANA  
Senate §4018. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4046. FALL RIVER HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS AND RHODE ISLAND  
Senate §3071(b). No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4047. CLINTON RIVER, MICHIGAN  
House §4039. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4048. HAMBURG AND GREEN OAK TOWNSHIPS, MICHIGAN  
House §4040. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4049. LAKE ERIE AT LUNA PIER, MICHIGAN  
Senate §4019. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4050. DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MINNESOTA AND WISCONSIN  
House §4041. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4051. NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI  
House §4042. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4052. DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL, NEW JERSEY  
House §4044. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4053. BAYONNE, NEW JERSEY  
House §4045. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4054. CARTERET, NEW JERSEY  
House §4046. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4055. GLOUCESTER COUNTY, NEW JERSEY  
House §4047. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4056. PERTH AMBOY, NEW JERSEY  
House §4048. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.
- SEC. 4057. BATAVIA, NEW YORK  
House §4049. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4058. BIG SISTER CREEK, EVANS, NEW YORK  
House §4050. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4059. FINGER LAKES, NEW YORK  
House §4051. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4060. LAKE ERIE SHORELINE, BUFFALO, NEW YORK  
House §4052. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4061. NEWTOWN CREEK, NEW YORK  
House §4053. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4062. NIAGARA RIVER, NEW YORK  
House §4054. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4063. SHORE PARKWAY GREENWAY, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK  
House §4055. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4064. UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NEW YORK  
House §4056. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4065. LINCOLN COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA  
House §4057. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4066. WILKES COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA  
House §4058. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4067. YADKINVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA  
House §4059. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4068. FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, OHIO  
Senate §4022. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4069. LAKE ERIE, OHIO  
House §4060. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4070. OHIO RIVER, OHIO  
House §4061, Senate §4024.—Same.
- SEC. 4071. TOLEDO HARBOR DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT, TOLEDO, OHIO  
Senate §4025. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4072. TOLEDO HARBOR, MAUMEE RIVER, AND LAKE CHANNEL PROJECT, TOLEDO, OHIO  
Senate §4026. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4073. ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FISH PASSAGE IMPROVEMENTS, OREGON  
House §4062. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4074. WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN, OREGON  
House §4063, Senate §4038.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4075. CHARTIERS CREEK WATERSHED, PENNSYLVANIA  
House §4064. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4076. KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PENNSYLVANIA  
House §4065. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4077. WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION  
House §4066. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4078. WILLIAMSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA  
House §4067. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4079. YARDLEY BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA  
House §4068. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4080. RIO VALENCIANO, JUNCOS, PUERTO RICO  
House §4069. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.
- SEC. 4081. WOONSOCKET LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, BLACKSTONE RIVER BASIN, RHODE ISLAND  
Senate §4027. No comparable House section.—House recedes.
- SEC. 4082. CROOKED CREEK, BENNETTSVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA  
House §4070. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.



SEC. 4083. BROAD RIVER, YORK COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

House §4071. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4084. SAVANNAH RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA

Senate §4028. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 4085. CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE

House §4072. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4086. CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE

House §4073. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4087. CUMBERLAND RIVER, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

House §4074. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4088. LEWIS, LAWRENCE, AND WAYNE COUNTIES, TENNESSEE

House §4075. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4089. WOLF RIVER AND NONCONNAH CREEK, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

House §4076. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4090. ABILENE, TEXAS

House §4077. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4091. COASTAL TEXAS ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND RESTORATION, TEXAS

House §4078. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4092. PORT OF GALVESTON, TEXAS

House §4079. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4093. GRAND COUNTY AND MOAB, UTAH

House §4080. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4094. SOUTHWESTERN UTAH

House §4081. No comparable Senate Section.—Senate Recedes.

SEC. 4095. ECOSYSTEM AND HYDROPOWER GENERATION DAMS, VERMONT

Senate §4030. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 4096. ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

House §4083, Senate §4034.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4097. MONONGAHELA RIVER BASIN, NORTHERN WEST VIRGINIA

House §4084. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4098. KENOSHA HARBOR, WISCONSIN

House §4085. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4099. JOHNSONVILLE DAM, JOHNSONVILLE, WISCONSIN

House §4087, Senate §4035.—Same.

SEC. 4100. WAUWATOSA, WISCONSIN

House §4086. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 4101. DEBRIS REMOVAL

Senate §4036. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

#### TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 5001. MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION CHANNELS

5001(a)(1). Manatee Harbor Basin, Florida. House §5001(a)(1). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

5001(a)(2). Tampa Harbor, Sparkman Channel and Davis Island, Florida. No comparable Senate or House section.

5001(a)(3). West turning basin, Canaveral Harbor, Florida. House §5001(a)(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

5001(a)(4). Bayou LaFourche Channel, Port Fourchon, Louisiana. House §5001(a)(3). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

5001(a)(5). Calcasieu River at Devil's Elbow, Louisiana. House §5001(a)(4). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

5001(a)(6). Pidgeon Industrial Harbor, Pidgeon Industrial Park, Memphis Harbor, Tennessee. House §5001(a)(5). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

5001(a)(7). Houston Ship Channel, Bayport Cruise Channel and Bayport Cruise turning basin, as part of the existing Bayport Channel, Texas. No comparable Senate or House section.

5001(a)(8). Pix Bayou Navigation Channel, Chambers County, Texas. House §5001(a)(6). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

5001(a)(9). Jacintoport Channel at Houston Ship Channel, Texas. No comparable Senate or House section.

5001(a)(10). Racine Harbor, Wisconsin. House §5001(a)(7). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 5002. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

House §5002. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

Subsection (d) of §5002 authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance to non-federal interests for carrying out watershed management, restoration and development projects in the following locations: Charlotte Harbor watershed, Florida; Those portions of the watersheds of the Chattahoochee, Etowah, Flint, Ocmulgee, and Oconee Rivers lying within the counties of Bartow, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Fulton, Forsyth, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Paulding, Rockdale, and Walton, Georgia; Kinkaid Lake, Jackson County, Illinois; Amite River basin, Louisiana; East Atchafalaya River basin, Iberville Parish and Pointe Coupee Parish, Louisiana; Red River watershed, Louisiana; Taunton River basin, Massachusetts; Marlboro Township, New Jersey; Esopus, Plattekill, and Rondout Creeks, Greene, Sullivan, and Ulster Counties, New York; Greenwood Lake watershed, New York and New Jersey; Long Island Sound watershed, New York; Ramapo River watershed, New York; Tuscarawas River basin, Ohio; Western Lake Erie basin, Ohio; Those portions of the watersheds of the Beaver, Upper Ohio, Connoquenessing, Lower Allegheny, Kiskiminetas, Lower Monongahela, Youghiogheny, Shenango, and Mahoning Rivers lying within the counties of Beaver, Butler, Lawrence, and Mercer, Pennsylvania; Otter Creek watershed, Pennsylvania; Unami Creek watershed, Milford Township, Pennsylvania; and Sauk River basin, Washington.

#### SEC. 5003. DAM SAFETY

House §5003. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

Section 5003(a) authorizes the Secretary to provide assistance to enhance dam safety at the following locations: Keith Creek, Rockford, Illinois; Mount Zion Mill Pond Dam, Fulton County, Indiana; Fish Creek Dam, Blaine County, Idaho; Hamilton Dam, Flint River, Flint, Michigan; Congers Lake Dam, Rockland County, New York; Lake Lucille Dam, New City, New York; Peconic River Dams, town of Riverhead, Suffolk, Long Island, New York; Pine Grove Lakes Dam, Sloatsburg, New York; State Dam, Auburn, New York; Whaley Lake Dam, Pawling, New York; Brightwood Dam, Concord Township, Ohio; Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania; Leaser Lake Dam, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania; Stillwater Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania; Wissahickon Creek Dam, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

#### SEC. 5004. STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY EVALUATIONS

House §5004. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

#### SEC. 5005. FLOOD MITIGATION PRIORITY AREAS

House §5005. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

Section 5005(a)(3) adds the following locations to Section 212(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332(e)): Ascension Parish, Louisiana; East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana; Iberville Parish, Louisiana; Livingston Parish, Louisiana; and Pointe Coupee Parish, Louisiana.

#### SEC. 5006. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR AUTHORIZED PROJECTS

House §5006, Senate §3008.—Senate recedes. The managers recognize that in carrying out the project for the Colonias along the United States-Mexico border, the Secretary may provide assistance to projects in Webb, Zapata, Starr, and Hidalgo counties, Texas.

#### SEC. 5007. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF REPORTS AND CONSTRUCTION FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS

House §5007, 5038, and 7010(2). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

Section 5007 directs the Secretary to expedite completion of the reports, and if the Secretary finds that the project is feasible, to expedite completion of construction of following projects: Project for navigation, Whittier, Alaska; Laguna Creek watershed flood damage reduction project, California; Daytona Beach shore protection project, Florida; Flagler Beach shore protection project, Florida; St. Johns County shore protection project, Florida; Chenier Plain environmental restoration project, Louisiana; False River, Louisiana; Fulmer Creek, Village of Mohawk, New York; Moyer Creek, Village of Frankfort, New York; Steele Creek, Village of Ilion, New York; Oriskany Wildlife Management Area, Rome, New York; Whitney Point Lake, Otselec River, Whitney Point, New York; North River, Peabody, Massachusetts; and Chenango Lake, Chenango County, New York.

The managers request that a timetable for the execution and completion of a feasibility cost-sharing agreement and initiation of construction of the Laguna Creek watershed flood damage reduction project, Fremont, California, be provided to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives within 90 days of the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

#### SEC. 5008. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF REPORTS FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS

House §5008(a), Senate §4012.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

Section 5008(a) directs the Secretary to expedite completion of the following reports, and, if the Secretary determines that the project is justified, authorizes the Secretary to proceed to project preconstruction, engineering and design: Project for water supply, Little Red River, Arkansas; Watershed study, Fountain Creek, north of Pueblo, Colorado; Project for shoreline stabilization, Egmont Key, Florida; Project for navigation, Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas and Louisiana; and Project for ecosystem restoration, University Lake, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

In carrying out the review of the project for navigation, Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas and Louisiana, referred to in subsection (a)(3), the Secretary is directed to utilize all current available data, models, and analyses to facilitate the scheduled completion of the Chief of Engineers report.

House §5008(b). No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

#### SEC. 5009. SOUTHEASTERN WATER RESOURCES ASSESSMENT

House §5009. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5010. MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT  
House §5011, Senate §3109.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5011. GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM  
House §5012, Senate §3141.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5012. GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS AND SEDIMENT REMEDIATION  
House §5013, Senate §3142.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5013. GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODELS  
House §5014, Senate §3143.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5014. GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION AND PROTECTION

House §5015 and 5016, Senate §5029.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The Great Lakes contain 134 deep-draft harbors and six connecting channels within the Corps of Engineers' dredging responsibility, including 25 of the nation's largest ports. The total waterborne commerce on the Great Lakes equals nearly 7 percent of the nation's maritime commerce. Recent shortfalls in the Corps' dredging appropriation have delayed dredging at many Great Lakes ports and waterways. The low water levels that have plagued the Lakes since the late 1990s have only exacerbated the problem. As a result, the largest vessels in the Great Lakes fleet must forfeit nearly 270 tons of cargo for each 1-inch reduction in loaded draft. Ocean-going vessels in the international trade lose roughly 100 tons of cargo for each 1-inch loss of draft.

Section 5014(a) directs the Secretary, using available appropriated funds, to expedite the operation and maintenance, including dredging, of the navigation features of the Great Lakes and Connecting Channels for the purpose of supporting commercial navigation to authorized project depths.

SEC. 5015. SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY  
House §5017. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5016. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER DISPERSAL BARRIER PROJECT

House §5018, Senate §4021.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5017. ESTUARY RESTORATION  
Senate §5002. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5018. MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MITIGATION, RECOVERY, AND RESTORATION, IOWA, KANSAS, MISSOURI, MONTANA, NEBRASKA, NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, AND WYOMING

Senate §5016. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5019. SUSQUEHANNA, DELAWARE, AND POTOMAC RIVER BASINS, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA, AND VIRGINIA

House §5019, Senate §5010.—House recedes.

SEC. 5020. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM  
House §5020, Senate §3068.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5021. CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RESTORATION, VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND  
Senate §3124. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5022. HYPOXIA ASSESSMENT  
House §5021. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5023. POTOMAC RIVER WATERSHED ASSESSMENT AND TRIBUTARY STRATEGY EVALUATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

House §5022. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5024. LOCK AND DAM SECURITY  
House §5023. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5025. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON SURVIVAL

House §5025. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5026. WAGE SURVEYS  
House §5135. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5027. REHABILITATION  
House §5024. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5028. AUBURN, ALABAMA  
House §5026. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5029. PINHOOK CREEK, HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA  
House §5027. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5030. ALASKA  
House §5028, Senate §5004.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5031. BARROW, ALASKA  
House §5029. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5032. LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, SEWARD, ALASKA

House §5034. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5033. ST. HERMAN AND ST. PAUL HARBORS, KODIAK, ALASKA

House §5035, Senate §3001.—Same.

SEC. 5034. TANANA RIVER, ALASKA  
House §5036. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5035. WRANGELL HARBOR, ALASKA  
House §5039. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5036. AUGUSTA AND CLARENDON, ARKANSAS  
House §5040, Senate §3007.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5037. DES ARC LEVEE PROTECTION, ARKANSAS

House §5041. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5038. LOOMIS LANDING, ARKANSAS

House §5042. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5039. CALIFORNIA  
Senate §5005. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5040. CALAVERAS RIVER AND LITTLEJOHN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA

Senate §5007. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5041. CAMBRIA, CALIFORNIA  
House §5044. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5042. CONTRA COSTA CANAL, OAKLEY AND KNIGHTSEN, CALIFORNIA; MALLARD SLOUGH, PITTSBURG, CALIFORNIA

House §5045. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5043. DANA POINT HARBOR, CALIFORNIA  
House §5046. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5044. EAST SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

House §5047. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5045. EASTERN SANTA CLARA BASIN, CALIFORNIA

House §5048. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5046. LA-3 DREDGED MATERIAL OCEAN DISPOSAL SITE DESIGNATION, CALIFORNIA

Senate §3016. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5047. LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA  
House §5049. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5048. LOS OSOS, CALIFORNIA  
House §5050. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5049. PINE FLAT DAM FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT, CALIFORNIA

House §5051, Senate §3021.—House recedes.

SEC. 5050. RAYMOND BASIN, SIX BASINS, CHINO BASIN, AND SAN GABRIEL BASIN, CALIFORNIA

House §5052. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5051. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA  
House §5053. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5052. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT AREA

House §5054, Senate §3025.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5053. SAN PABLO BAY, CALIFORNIA, WATERSHED AND SUISUN MARSH ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

House §5055, Senate §4011.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5054. ST. HELENA, CALIFORNIA  
Senate §4008. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5055. UPPER CALAVERAS RIVER, STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA

House §5056. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5056. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS

Senate §5008, House §5002(d)(9).—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5057. CHARLES HERVEY TOWNSEND BREAKWATER, NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CONNECTICUT

House §5057, Senate §3030.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5058. STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

No comparable Senate or House section.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5059. DELMARVA CONSERVATION CORRIDOR, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, AND VIRGINIA

House §5081, Senate §5009.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5060. ANACOSTIA RIVER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND

House §5080, Senate §5011.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5061. EAST CENTRAL AND NORTHEAST FLORIDA

House §5060. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5062. FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

House §5058. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5063. LAKE WORTH, FLORIDA

House §5059. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5064. BIG CREEK, GEORGIA, WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AND RESTORATION PROGRAM  
Senate §5012. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 5065. METROPOLITAN NORTH GEORGIA WATER PLANNING DISTRICT

Senate §5013. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 5066. SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

No comparable Senate or House section.  
The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5067. IDAHO, MONTANA, RURAL NEVADA, NEW MEXICO, RURAL UTAH, AND WYOMING  
Senate §5014. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5068. RILEY CREEK RECREATION AREA, IDAHO  
House §5062. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5069. FLOODPLAIN MAPPING, LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
House §5066. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5070. RECONSTRUCTION OF ILLINOIS AND MISSOURI FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS  
House §5063, Senate §3049.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5071. ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION  
House §5064, Senate §3048.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5072. PROMONTORY POINT THIRD-PARTY REVIEW, CHICAGO SHORELINE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
House §5067, Senate §4017. House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5073. KASKASKIA RIVER BASIN, ILLINOIS, RESTORATION  
House §5065. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5074. SOUTHWEST ILLINOIS  
House §5068. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5075. CALUMET REGION, INDIANA  
House §5070. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5076. FLOODPLAIN MAPPING, MISSOURI RIVER, IOWA  
House §5071. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5077. PADUCAH, KENTUCKY  
House §5072. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5078. SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY  
House §5073. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5079. WINCHESTER, KENTUCKY

House §5074. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5080. BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

House §5075. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5081. CALCASIEU SHIP CHANNEL, LOUISIANA  
House §5076. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5082. EAST ATCHAFALAYA BASIN AND AMITE RIVER BASIN REGION, LOUISIANA  
House §5077. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5083. INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK PROJECT, LOUISIANA  
Senate §5028. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5084. LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LOUISIANA  
No comparable Senate or House section.

SEC. 5085. SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA REGION, LOUISIANA  
Senate §5017. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5086. WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LOUISIANA  
House §5078. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5087. CHARLESTOWN, MARYLAND  
House §5079. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5088. ST. MARY'S RIVER, MARYLAND  
No comparable House or Senate section.

SEC. 5089. MASSACHUSETTS DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITES  
House §5082. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5090. ONTONAGON HARBOR, MICHIGAN  
House §5083. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5091. CROOKSTON, MINNESOTA  
House §5084. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5092. GARRISON AND KATHIO TOWNSHIP, MINNESOTA  
House §5085. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5093. ITASCA COUNTY, MINNESOTA  
House §5086. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5094. MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA  
House §5087. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5095. NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA  
House §5088. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5096. WILD RICE RIVER, MINNESOTA  
House §5089, Senate §4020.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5097. MISSISSIPPI  
Senate §5018. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5098. HARRISON, HANCOCK, AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MISSISSIPPI

House §5090. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5099. MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS

House §5091. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5100. ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI  
House §5092. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5101. ST. LOUIS REGIONAL GREENWAYS, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

No comparable Senate or House section.  
The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development

projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

## SEC. 5102. MISSOULA, MONTANA

No comparable Senate or House section.  
The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5103. ST. MARY PROJECT, GLACIER COUNTY, MONTANA  
Senate §5019. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

In carrying out this section, the managers expect the Secretary to conduct all hiring and contracting in accordance with the requirements set forth in the Indian Self Determination Act.

SEC. 5104. LOWER PLATTE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, NEBRASKA

Senate §5020, House §5002(d)(8).—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5105. HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS AREA, NEW JERSEY

House §5093. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5106. ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK  
House §5094. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5107. COLLEGE POINT, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

House §5095. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5108. FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

House §5096. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5109. HUDSON RIVER, NEW YORK  
House §5097. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development

projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5110. MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NEW YORK

House §5098. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5111. NORTH HEMPSTED AND GLEN COVE NORTH SHORE WATERSHED RESTORATION, NEW YORK

No comparable Senate or House section.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5112. ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

No comparable Senate or House section.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5113. NORTH CAROLINA

Senate §5021. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5114. STANLY COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

House §5100. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5115. JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, NORTH CAROLINA

House §5099. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5116. CINCINNATI, OHIO

House §5101. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5117. OHIO RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Senate §5022. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5118. TOUSSAINT RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, CARROLL TOWNSHIP, OHIO

House §5102, Senate §3095.—House recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5119. STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE WATER PLANNING, OKLAHOMA

Senate §5023. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5120. FERN RIDGE DAM, OREGON

House §5104. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5121. ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

House §5105. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5122. CLINTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

House §5106. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5123. KEHLY RUN DAMS, PENNSYLVANIA

House §5107. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5124. LEHIGH RIVER, LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

House §5108. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5125. NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA

House §5109. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5126. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK

House §5110, Senate §3105.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5127. CANO MARTIN PENA, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO

House §5111. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

SEC. 5128. LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA

No comparable House or Senate section.

SEC. 5129. CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE, AND TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION, SOUTH DAKOTA.

House §5112, Senate §5024.—Same.

SEC. 5130. EAST TENNESSEE

House §5113. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5131. FRITZ LANDING, TENNESSEE

House §5114. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5132. J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TENNESSEE

House §5115. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5133. NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

No comparable Senate or House section.

The managers recognize the importance of waterfront and riverfront development projects to local communities and that, in some instances, waterfront and riverfront development plans contain elements that fall within traditional Corps mission areas of navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration, and associated recreation. However, the managers believe that waterfront and riverfront development projects, in and of themselves, are not a Corps mission and Corps participation in these development projects must be limited to traditional Corps missions. While recreation is frequently an element of waterfront and riverfront development projects, the managers do not intend for the Corps to carry out purely recreational elements of the project, unrelated to the traditional missions of the Corps. The managers direct the Corps to limit its work on recreation features to only those elements that relate to the traditional Corps mission areas that are being built as an element of the larger waterfront and riverfront development project plan.

SEC. 5134. NONCONNAH WEIR, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

Senate §3110. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5135. TENNESSEE RIVER PARTNERSHIP

House §5117. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5136. TOWN CREEK, LENOIR CITY, TENNESSEE

House §5116. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5137. UPPER MISSISSIPPI EMBAYMENT, TENNESSEE, ARKANSAS, AND MISSISSIPPI

House §5118. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5138. TEXAS

Senate §5025. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5139. BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TEXAS

House §5119. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5140. DALLAS COUNTY REGION, TEXAS

House §5120. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5141. DALLAS FLOODWAY, DALLAS, TEXAS

House §5121. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5142. HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

House §5122, Senate §3117.—House recedes.

SEC. 5143. JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON, TEXAS

House §5123, Senate §4029.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5144. ONION CREEK, TEXAS

House §5124. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

SEC. 5145. CONNECTICUT RIVER DAMS, VERMONT

Senate §5026. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5146. LAKE CHAMPLAIN CANAL, VERMONT AND NEW YORK

Senate §4032. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

SEC. 5147. DYKE MARSH, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

House §5126. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5148. EASTERN SHORE AND SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA

House §5125. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5149. JAMES RIVER, VIRGINIA

Senate §3125. No comparable House section.—House recedes.

## SEC. 5150. BAKER BAY AND ILWACO HARBOR, WASHINGTON

House §5127, Senate §4033.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5151. HAMILTON ISLAND CAMPGROUND, WASHINGTON

House §5128. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5152. EROSION CONTROL, PUGET ISLAND, WAHIAKUM COUNTY, WASHINGTON

House §5129, Senate §3127.—House recedes.

## SEC. 5153. WILLAPA BAY, WASHINGTON

House §5130. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5154. WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL

House §5131. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5155. CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA

House §5132. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5156. SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA

House §5133. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 5157. CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS

House §5134, Senate §2011.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

(12) Perris, California

(13) Thornton Reservoir, Cook County, Illinois.

(14) Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana.

(15) Buffalo Bayou, Texas.

(16) Halls Bayou, Texas.

(17) Menomonee River Watershed, Wisconsin.

## SEC. 5158. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL PROJECTS

House §5136, Senate §5003. House recedes, with an amendment.

## TITLE VI—FLORIDA EVERGLADES

## SEC. 6001. HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER, FLORIDA

House §6001, Senate §3037.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 6002. PILOT PROJECTS

House §6002. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 6003. MAXIMUM COSTS

House §6004, Senate §3034.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 6004. CREDIT

House §6006. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

The managers are concerned about the practice of the non-Federal sponsor performing work on the project without a written agreement with the Corps, and then relying upon legislation to receive credit against the non-Federal share. Consistent with section 2003 of this bill, for future work to be considered eligible for credit, it must be performed under a written agreement with the Secretary.

## SEC. 6005. OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE

House §6007. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 6006. CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS

House §6008, Senate §3036. House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 6007. REGIONAL ENGINEERING MODEL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

House §6011. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## INITIAL PROJECTS, COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN, FLORIDA

The managers have agreed to delete House section 6003 that would have increased the maximum cost for three initial projects of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP)—Water Conservation Areas 3A/3B Levee Seepage Management, C-11 Impoundment and Stormwater Treatment Area, and C-9 Impoundment and Stormwater Treatment Area. These projects are still undergoing study and final cost estimates are not available. Project components of CERP have seen their cost estimates vary widely during the project formulation and design phases. The managers support the completion of the studies on these projects prior to taking action on their cost estimates. Until the final project implementation report recommends final cost estimates, the managers believe that it is premature to enact new cost figures.

The project implementation reports for the three projects are projected to be completed in 2008. The managers expect to consider the correct authorization levels for these projects in a water resources bill next year.

## MODIFIED WATER DELIVERIES PROJECT, FLORIDA

The Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, Public Law 101-229, (1989 Act), authorized the expansion of Everglades National Park (Park), a change to more natural water deliveries to the Park, and flood damage reduction measures for the area known as the eight and one-half square mile area. Of the three activities, there still has been no change in water deliveries to the Park. Without a change in water delivery to the Park, restoration of the Everglades, and many of the projects authorized as components of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) in 2000, will not succeed.

To achieve more natural water deliveries to the Park, it is necessary to modify the way water crosses under the Tamiami Trail Highway. The managers of the bill are concerned that nearly 18 years have passed since the 1989 Act, and the restoration of more natural water flows has not occurred. While the House bill contained language directing a particular option toward restoring flows, the Corps of Engineers and other interested parties have indicated that the “two-bridge” option may not be the preferred solution. However, the managers are concerned that continuing re-analysis of options for modifying water deliveries will only delay benefits to the Everglades.

The managers have observed proposals related to improved water deliveries to the Park come and go over the years, yet the more natural flows to the Park do not occur. It is time for the Chief of Engineers to implement measures to improve water deliveries and adopt an adaptive management approach toward restoring flows.

The managers have agreed to delete the House language on the two-bridge option. The managers direct the Chief of Engineers to re-examine options to modify the water delivery to the Park. However, the managers also direct the Chief of Engineer to pursue immediate steps to increase flows to the Park of at least 1400 cubic feet per second, without significantly increasing the risk of roadbed failure. Flows less than 1400 cubic feet per second will not produce measurable benefits to the Park.

The managers direct the Chief of Engineers to proceed with increasing flows to the Park upon the completion of the eight and one-half square mile area construction this fall. Completing that construction removes the current constraint on water levels within the Northeast Shark River Slough area of the Park.

The managers direct the Chief of Engineers to re-examine the prior reports and environmental documentation associated with modifying water deliveries to the Park prepared under the 1989 Act, and to evaluate the practicable alternatives for increasing the flow of water under the highway and into the Park. The recommendations resulting from this re-examination are to be for improving flows in a manner that is consistent with the direction in the 1989 Act that the Secretary of the Army construct modifications “to improve water deliveries into the park and shall, to the extent practicable, take steps to restore the natural hydrological conditions within the Park.” The managers direct that the flows to the Park have a minimum target of 4000 cubic feet per second so as to address the restoration envisioned in the 1989 Act.

The Chief of Engineers is to develop the recommendations in consultation with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Transportation, the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, the Seminole Tribe of Florida, and the State of Florida, and shall consider environmental benefits produced, cost, related CERP improvements, and other relevant factors.

The recommendations of the Chief of Engineers shall identify a plan for increasing and distributing water flows to the Park through project components that take into account the fact that a subsequent project involving modifications to the Tamiami Trail Highway may be accomplished under the authority of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000. Modifications that are not compatible with that project or are duplicative should be avoided.

The recommendations of the Chief of Engineers shall be available for public review and comment consistent with applicable law, and shall be submitted to Congress not later than July 1, 2008.

Concurrent with the preparation of recommendations for modifying water deliveries under the 1989 Act, the managers direct the Chief of Engineers to initiate an evaluation of the Tamiami Trail project component of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan authorized by section 601(b)(2)(C)(viii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, or other appropriate authorities, as soon as practicable. The recommendations shall include an evaluation of modifying Tamiami Trail from Krome Avenue to the boundary of the Big Cypress National Park to restore natural flows and ecological connectivity through the Park to Florida Bay. Upon completion of these recommendations the Chief of Engineers shall submit the recommendations to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

The House language in section 6009 also addressed cost allocations between the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior. The managers direct that any arrangements for sharing of costs between the Secretaries be prospective only. The managers do not support any arrangement where the Secretary of the Interior is credited with expenditures for land acquisition toward the costs of modifying the water delivery to the Park. These costs represent separate responsibilities within the missions of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior, and the costs of one should not be used to offset the costs of the other.

## TITLE VII—LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA

## SEC. 7001. DEFINITIONS

House §7001. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7002. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

House §7002, Senate §1003(h).—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7003. LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA

House §7003, Senate §1003(a) and (b).—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7004. COASTAL LOUISIANA ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND RESTORATION TASK FORCE

House §7004, Senate §1003(i).—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7005. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

House §7005, Senate §1003(m).—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7006. CONSTRUCTION

House §7006, Senate §1003(c), (d), (e), (f) and (j).—House recedes, with an amendment.

For the benefit of the Louisiana coastal area, the managers have authorized a number of projects and programs. In the case of the Additional Projects authorized in section 7006(e), the managers have authorized 4 projects for construction and have authorized 6 other projects contingent upon a Chief's Report being completed no later than December 31, 2010. The managers understand that the 4 projects authorized for construction are closer to having a completed study than are the other 6 projects. The managers expect the Secretary to plan and construct all of these projects on a priority and a schedule that maximizes the efficient and timely delivery of benefits.

## SEC. 7007. NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE

House §7007, Senate §1003(g).—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7008. PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

House §7008, Senate §1003(k).—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 7009. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

House §7009, Senate §1003(n).—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7010. EXPEDITED REPORTS

House §7010, Senate §1003(t).—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7011. REPORTING

House §7011. No comparable Senate provision.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 7012. NEW ORLEANS AND VICINITY

House §7012, Senate §1003(p).—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7013. MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET

House §7013, Senate §1003(s).—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7014. HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION

Senate §1003(u). No comparable House provision.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7015. LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW

Senate §1003(q). No comparable House provision.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 7016. LOWER JEFFERSON PARISH, LOUISIANA

Senate §1003(r). No comparable House provision.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## TITLE VIII—UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM

## SEC. 8001. DEFINITIONS

House §8001, Senate §1002(a).—Same.

## SEC. 8002. NAVIGATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS AND RESTORATION

House §8002. No comparable Senate section.—Senate recedes.

## SEC. 8003. AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF NAVIGATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

House §8003, Senate §1002(b).—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 8004. ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AUTHORIZATION

House §8004, Senate §1002(c).—Senate recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 8005. COMPARABLE PROGRESS

House §8005, Senate §1002(d).—Senate recedes.

## TITLE IX—NATIONAL LEVEE SAFETY PROGRAM

## SEC. 9001. SHORT TITLE

Senate §2051. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 9002. DEFINITIONS

Senate §2052. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 9003. COMMITTEE ON LEVEE SAFETY

Senate §2053 and 2054. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 9004. INVENTORY AND INSPECTION OF LEVEES

Senate §2054. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## SEC. 9005. LIMITATIONS ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION

No comparable House or Senate section.

## SEC. 9006. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Senate §2055. No comparable House section.—House recedes, with an amendment.

## ADDITIONAL MATTERS

The managers request the Secretary make it a priority to reimburse non-federal project sponsors for carrying out federal projects in accordance with cooperative agreements. These projects provide benefits to the federal taxpayer and the Corps of Engineers should make every effort to reimburse non-federal project sponsors the appropriate amount in a timely manner. In one instance, Manatee County, Florida carried out the Anna Maria Island beach re-nourishment under a cooperative agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers for construction of the Manatee

County Shore Protection Project in 2002. For Fiscal Year 2002, Congress appropriated \$1 million for the project, and in Fiscal Year 2003, Congress appropriated \$3.5 million for the project. Yet, Manatee County has received only \$2.3 million in reimbursement from the Army Corps of Engineers and is still owed over \$1.7 million for work that was completed in 2002. Many local communities and other non-federal project sponsors that undertake federal projects put their financial security at stake and timely reimbursement by the Corps of Engineers is critical to their economic prosperity.

The Corps recently determined that the stability of Wolf Creek Dam is threatened by seepage under and around the dam, increasing the risk of catastrophic failure. The managers recognize that the Corps has cited an extreme concern for safety and lowered the level of Lake Cumberland dramatically to mitigate the risk of failure. The managers recognize that the Nashville District of the Corps has recommended that this project be classified as a dam safety project and therefore subject to reimbursement rates in accordance with the Dam Safety Act. Given the threat to safety as cited by the Corps and the recommendation by the Corps district office, the managers urge the administration to accept the recommendation of the Corps to classify this project as dam safety, and to finalize such a decision as soon as possible.

The managers have increasingly heard concerns from Members of Congress regarding the backlog in the processing of permits under section 404 of the Clean Water Act. In particular, the Jacksonville District of the Corps of Engineers processes 1/8 of all the permits nationwide. The managers direct the Chief of Engineers to examine the permitting workload and consider alternatives for better distribution of the workload. The managers also direct the Chief of Engineers to work with States using current authorities to minimize the time required for the Corps to respond to permit applications.

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is required to include a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits (as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives) in the Conference Report. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure requires Members of Congress to comply with all requirements of clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI. The following table provides the list of such provisions included in the Conference Report:



**Earmarks for  
Water Resources Development Act of 2007**

<b>Conference Section</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Member</b>
1001(01)	Haines, Alaska	Murkowski
1001(01)	Haines, Alaska	Stevens
1001(01)	Haines, Alaska	Young, D.
1001(02)	Port Lions, Alaska	Young, D.
1001(03)	Santa Cruz River, Paseo De Las Iglesias, Arizona	Farr
1001(04)	Tanque Verde Creek, Pima County, Arizona	Kyl
1001(04)	Tanque Verde Creek, Pima County, Arizona	Giffords
1001(04)	Tanque Verde Creek, Pima County, Arizona	Grijalva
1001(05)	Salt River (Rio Salado Oeste), Maricopa County, Arizona	Pastor
1001(06)	Salt River (Va Shly'ay Akimel), Maricopa County, Arizona	Mitchell
1001(06)	Salt River (Va Shly'ay Akimel), Maricopa County, Arizona	Kyl
1001(07)	May Branch, Forth Smith, Kentucky	Lincoln
1001(07)	May Branch, Forth Smith, Kentucky	Pryor
1001(07)	May Branch, Forth Smith, Kentucky	Boozman
1001(08)	Hamilton City, Glenn County, California	Herger
1001(08)	Hamilton City, Glenn County, California	Boxer
1001(09)	Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California	Davis, S.
1001(09)	Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California	Boxer
1001(10)	Matilija Dam, Ventura County, California	Gallegly
1001(10)	Matilija Dam, Ventura County, California	Capps
1001(10)	Matilija Dam, Ventura County, California	Boxer
1001(11)	Middle Creek, Lake County, California	Boxer
1001(11)	Middle Creek, Lake County, California	Thompson
1001(12)	Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California	Woolsey
1001(12)	Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California	Thompson
1001(12)	Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California	Miller, George
1001(12)	Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California	Boxer
1001(12)	Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California	Tauscher
1001(13)	Denver County Reach, South Platte River, Denver, Colorado	Allard
1001(13)	Denver County Reach, South Platte River, Denver, Colorado	Tancredo
1001(13)	Denver County Reach, South Platte River, Denver, Colorado	Salazar
1001(14)	Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon, Florida	Nelson
1001(14)	Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon, Florida	Martinez
1001(14)	Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon, Florida	Mahoney
1001(15)	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Picayune Strand Restoration Project, Collier County, Florida	Martinez
1001(15)	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Picayune Strand Restoration Project, Collier County, Florida	Nelson
1001(15)	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Picayune Strand Restoration Project, Collier County, Florida	Diaz-Balart, M.

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
	County, Florida	
1001(15)	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Picayune Strand Restoration Project, Collier County, Florida	Mahoney
1001(16)	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Site 1	Mahoney
1001(16)	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Site 1	Hastings, A.
1001(16)	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central and Southern Florida, Site 1	Mahoney
1001(17)	Miami Harbor, Miami Dade County, Florida	Wasserman Schultz
1001(17)	Miami Harbor, Miami Dade County, Florida	Diaz-Balart, L.
1001(17)	Miami Harbor, Miami Dade County, Florida	Diaz-Balart, M.
1001(17)	Miami Harbor, Miami Dade County, Florida	Nelson
1001(17)	Miami Harbor, Miami Dade County, Florida	Martinez
1001(17)	Miami Harbor, Miami Dade County, Florida	Ros-Lehtinen
1001(18)	East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois	Durbin
1001(18)	East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois	Obama
1001(18)	East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois	Costello
1001(19)	Peoria Riverfront Development, Illinois	LaHood
1001(19)	Peoria Riverfront Development, Illinois	Durbin
1001(19)	Peoria Riverfront Development, Illinois	Obama
1001(20)	Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois	Obama
1001(20)	Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois	Costello
1001(20)	Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois	Durbin
1001(21)	Des Moines and Racoon Rivers. Des Moines, Iowa	Harkin
1001(21)	Des Moines and Racoon Rivers. Des Moines, Iowa	Boswell
1001(21)	Des Moines and Racoon Rivers. Des Moines, Iowa	Grassley
1001(22)	Licking River Basin, Cythiana, Kentucky	Davis, G.
1001(23)	Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana	Boustany
1001(23)	Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana	Jindal
1001(23)	Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana	Landrieu
1001(23)	Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana	Baker
1001(23)	Bayou Sorrel Lock, Louisiana	Vitter
1001(24)	Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana	Melancon
1001(24)	Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana	Landrieu
1001(24)	Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana	Vitter
1001(24)	Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana	Baker
1001(24)	Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana	Jindal

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1001(25)	Port of Iberia, Louisiana	Jindal
1001(25)	Port of Iberia, Louisiana	Melancon
1001(26)	Smith Island, Somerset County, Maryland	Cardin
1001(26)	Smith Island, Somerset County, Maryland	Gilchrest
1001(26)	Smith Island, Somerset County, Maryland	Mikulski
1001(27)	Roseau River, Roseau, Minnesota	Klobuchar
1001(27)	Roseau River, Roseau, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
1001(27)	Roseau River, Roseau, Minnesota	Coleman
1001(28)	Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, And North Kansas Levees Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas	Moore, D.
1001(28)	Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, And North Kansas Levees Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas	McCaskill
1001(28)	Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, And North Kansas Levees Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas	Roberts
1001(28)	Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, And North Kansas Levees Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas	Brownback
1001(28)	Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, And North Kansas Levees Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas	Bond
1001(28)	Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, And North Kansas Levees Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas	Cleaver
1001(29)	Swope Park Industrial Area, Blue River, Kansas City, Missouri	Bond
1001(29)	Swope Park Industrial Area, Blue River, Kansas City, Missouri	McCaskill
1001(29)	Swope Park Industrial Area, Blue River, Kansas City, Missouri	Cleaver
1001(30)	Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey	Menendez
1001(30)	Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey	Lautenberg
1001(30)	Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey	LoBiondo
1001(31)	Hudson Raritan Estuary, Liberty State Park, New Jersey	Sires
1001(31)	Hudson Raritan Estuary, Liberty State Park, New Jersey	Menendez
1001(31)	Hudson Raritan Estuary, Liberty State Park, New Jersey	Lautenberg
1001(32)	New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey	Saxton
1001(32)	New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey	Smith, C.
1001(32)	New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey	Menendez
1001(32)	New Jersey Shore Protection Study, Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey	Lautenberg
1001(33)	Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Union Beach, New Jersey	Menendez
1001(33)	Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Union Beach, New Jersey	Pallone

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1001(33)	Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Union Beach, New Jersey	Lautenberg
1001(34)	South River, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey	Lautenberg
1001(34)	South River, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey	Andrews, R.
1001(34)	South River, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey	Menendez
1001(35)	Southwest Valley, Bernalillo County, New Mexico	Domenici
1001(35)	Southwest Valley, Bernalillo County, New Mexico	Bingaman
1001(35)	Southwest Valley, Bernalillo County, New Mexico	Wilson, H.
1001(36)	Montauk Point, New York	Clinton
1001(36)	Montauk Point, New York	Bishop, T.
1001(37)	Hocking River Basin, Monday Creek, Ohio	Space
1001(37)	Hocking River Basin, Monday Creek, Ohio	Voinovich
1001(38)	Town of Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pennsylvania	Casey
1001(38)	Town of Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pennsylvania	Specter
1001(38)	Town of Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pennsylvania	Kanjorski
1001(39)	Pawleys Island, South Carolina	Graham
1001(39)	Pawleys Island, South Carolina	Brown, H.
1001(40)	Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Cristi, Texas	Hutchison
1001(40)	Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Cristi, Texas	Ortiz
1001(40)	Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Cristi, Texas	Cornyn
1001(41)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazos River to Port O'Connor, Matagorda Bay Re-route, Texas	Cornyn
1001(41)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazos River to Port O'Connor, Matagorda Bay Re-route, Texas	Hutchison
1001(41)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Matagorda Bay Re-route, Texas	Paul
1001(42)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, High Island to Brazos River, Texas	Hutchison
1001(42)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, High Island to Brazos River, Texas	Cornyn
1001(42)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, High Island to Brazos River, Texas	Paul
1001(43)	Lower Colorado River Basin Phase I, Texas	Hutchison
1001(43)	Lower Colorado River Basin Phase I, Texas	Cornyn
1001(43)	Lower Colorado River Basin Phase I, Texas	Doggett
1001(43)	Lower Colorado River Basin Phase I, Texas	McCaul
1001(44)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement, Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia	Webb
1001(44)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement, Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia	Forbes
1001(44)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Bridge Replacement, Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia	Warner
1001(45)	Craney Island Eastward Expansion, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Hampton Roads, Virginia	Webb
1001(45)	Craney Island Eastward Expansion, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Hampton Roads, Virginia	Warner
1001(45)	Craney Island Eastward Expansion, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Hampton Roads, Virginia	Scott, R.

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1001(46)	Centralia, Chehalis River, Lewis County, Washington	Cantwell
1001(46)	Centralia, Chehalis River, Lewis County, Washington	Murray
1001(46)	Centralia, Chehalis River, Lewis County, Washington	Dicks
1002(a)(01)	Haleyville, Alabama	Aderholt
1002(a)(02)	Weiss Lake, Alabama	Rogers, Mike D.
1002(a)(03)	Fort Yukon, Alaska	Young, D.
1002(a)(04)	Little Colorado Levee, Arizona	Renzi
1002(a)(05)	Cache River Basin, Grubbs, Arkansas	Pryor
1002(a)(05)	Cache River Basin, Grubbs, Arkansas	Lincoln
1002(a)(05)	Cache River Basin, Grubbs, Arkansas	Berry
1002(a)(06)	Barrel Springs Wash, Palmdale, California	McKeon
1002(a)(07)	Borrego Springs, California	Hunter
1002(a)(08)	Colton, California	Baca
1002(a)(09)	Dunlap Stream, San Bernardino, California	Lewis, J.
1002(a)(10)	Hunts Canyon Wash, Palmdale, California	McKeon
1002(a)(11)	Ontario and Chino, California	Miller, Gary
1002(a)(11)	Ontario and Chino, California	Baca
1002(a)(12)	Santa Venetia, California	Miller, George
1002(a)(12)	Santa Venetia, California	Tauscher
1002(a)(12)	Santa Venetia, California	Woolsey
1002(a)(13)	Whittier, California	Miller, Gary
1002(a)(14)	Wildwood Creek, Yucaipa, California	Lewis, J.
1002(a)(15)	Bibb County and City of Macon Levee, Georgia	Chambliss
1002(a)(15)	Bibb County and City of Macon Levee, Georgia	Isakson
1002(a)(16)	Ft. Wayne and Vicinity, Indiana	Souder
1002(a)(16)	Ft. Wayne and Vicinity, Indiana	Lugar
1002(a)(16)	Ft. Wayne and Vicinity, Indiana	Bayh
1002(a)(17)	St. Francisville, Louisiana	Baker
1002(a)(18)	Salem, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1002(a)(18)	Salem, Massachusetts	Kerry
1002(a)(18)	Salem, Massachusetts	Tierney
1002(a)(19)	Cass River, Michigan	Kildee
1002(a)(20)	Crow River, Rockford, Minnesota	Bachmann
1002(a)(20)	Crow River, Rockford, Minnesota	Klobuchar
1002(a)(20)	Crow River, Rockford, Minnesota	Coleman
1002(a)(21)	Marsh Creek, Minnesota	Klobuchar
1002(a)(21)	Marsh Creek, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
1002(a)(22)	South Branch of Wild Rice River, Borup, Minnesota	Klobuchar
1002(a)(22)	South Branch of Wild Rice River, Borup, Minnesota	Coleman
1002(a)(22)	South Branch of Wild Rice River, Borup, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
1002(a)(23)	Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, Missouri	Graves



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1002(a)(24)	Acid Brook, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey	Pascrell
1002(a)(25)	Cannistee River, Addison, New York	Kuhl
1002(a)(26)	Cohocton River, Campbell, New York	Kuhl
1002(a)(27)	Dry and Otter Creeks, Cortland, New York	Arcuri
1002(a)(28)	East River, Silver Beach, New York City, New York	Crowley
1002(a)(29)	East Valley Creek, Andover, New York	Kuhl
1002(a)(30)	Sunnyside Brook, Westchester County, New York	Engel
1002(a)(31)	Little Yankee Run and Mud Run, Trumbull County, Ohio	Ryan, T.
1002(a)(32)	Little Neshaminy Creek, Warrington, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
1002(a)(33)	Southampton Creek Watershed, Southampton, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
1002(a)(34)	Spring Creek, Lower Macungie Township, Pennsylvania	Dent
1002(a)(35)	Yardley Aqueduct, Silver and Brock Creeks, Yardley, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
1002(a)(36)	Surfside Beach, South Carolina	Brown, H.
1002(a)(37)	Sandy Creek, Jackson County, Tennessee	Alexander
1002(a)(38)	Congelosi Ditch, Missouri City, Texas	Green, A.
1002(a)(39)	Dilley, Texas	Cuellar
1002(a)(40)	Cheyenne, Wyoming	[Thomas]
1003(02)	St. Johns' Bluff Training Wall, Duval County, Florida	Brown, C.
1003(02)	St. Johns' Bluff Training Wall, Duval County, Florida	Crenshaw
1003(03)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Iberville Parish, Louisiana	Baker
1003(04)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana	Jindal
1003(04)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana	Ross
1003(05)	Piney Point Lighthouse, St. Mary's County, Maryland	Hoyer
1003(06)	Pug Hole Lake, Minnesota	Oberstar
1003(06)	Pug Hole Lake, Minnesota	Klobuchar
1003(07)	Middle Fork Grand River, Geny County, Missouri	Graves
1003(08)	Platte River, Platte City, Missouri	Graves
1003(09)	Rush Creek, Parkville, Missouri	Graves
1003(10)	Dry and Otter Creeks, Cortland County, New York	Arcuri
1003(11)	Keuka Lake, Hammondsport, New York	Kuhl
1003(12)	Kowawese Unique Area and Hudson River, New Windsor, New York	Hall, J.
1003(13)	Owego Creek, Tioga County, New York	Arcuri
1003(14)	Howard Road Outfall, Shelby County, Tennessee	Blackburn
1003(15)	Mitch Farm Ditch and Lateral D, Shelby County, Tennessee	Blackburn
1003(16)	Wolf River Tributaries, Shelby County, Tennessee	Blackburn
1003(17)	Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas	Barton
1003(18)	Wells River, Newbury, Vermont	Welch
1004(a)(01)	Barrow Harbor, Alaska	Stevens
1004(a)(01)	Barrow Harbor, Alaska	Murkowski
1004(a)(02)	Coffman Cove, Alaska	Young, D.



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1004(a)(03)	Kotzebue Harbor, Alaska	Young, D.
1004(a)(04)	Nome Harbor, Alaska	Stevens
1004(a)(04)	Nome Harbor, Alaska	Murkowski
1004(a)(05)	Old Harbor, Alaska	Stevens
1004(a)(05)	Old Harbor, Alaska	Murkowski
1004(a)(06)	Little Rock Port, Arkansas	Lincoln
1004(a)(06)	Little Rock Port, Arkansas	Pryor
1004(a)(07)	Mississippi River Ship Channel	Melancon
1004(a)(07)	Mississippi River Ship Channel	Jindal
1004(a)(07)	Mississippi River Ship Channel	Baker
1004(a)(08)	East Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Sandwich, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1004(a)(08)	East Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Sandwich, Massachusetts	Delahunt
1004(a)(08)	East Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Sandwich, Massachusetts	Kerry
1004(a)(09)	Lynn Harbor, Lynn, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1004(a)(09)	Lynn Harbor, Lynn, Massachusetts	Tierney
1004(a)(09)	Lynn Harbor, Lynn, Massachusetts	Kerry
1004(a)(10)	Merrimack River, Haverhill, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1004(a)(10)	Merrimack River, Haverhill, Massachusetts	[Meehan]
1004(a)(10)	Merrimack River, Haverhill, Massachusetts	Kerry
1004(a)(11)	Oak Bluffs Harbor, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts	Delahunt
1004(a)(11)	Oak Bluffs Harbor, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1004(a)(11)	Oak Bluffs Harbor, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts	Kerry
1004(a)(12)	Woods Hole Great Harbor, Falmouth, Massachusetts	Kerry
1004(a)(12)	Woods Hole Great Harbor, Falmouth, Massachusetts	Delahunt
1004(a)(12)	Woods Hole Great Harbor, Falmouth, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1004(a)(13)	Au Sable River, Michigan	Stabenow
1004(a)(13)	Au Sable River, Michigan	Stupak
1004(a)(14)	Clinton River, Michigan	Levin, C.
1004(a)(15)	Ontonagon River, Michigan	Stabenow
1004(a)(15)	Ontonagon River, Michigan	Levin, C.
1004(a)(16)	Outer Channel and Inner Harbor, Menominee Harbor, Michigan and Wisconsin	Stabenow
1004(a)(17)	Sebewaing River, Michigan	Stabenow
1004(a)(17)	Sebewaing River, Michigan	Levin, C.
1004(a)(18)	Traverse City Harbor, Traverse City, Michigan	Levin, C.
1004(a)(18)	Traverse City Harbor, Traverse City, Michigan	Stupak
1004(a)(18)	Traverse City Harbor, Traverse City, Michigan	Stabenow
1004(a)(18)	Traverse City Harbor, Traverse City, Michigan	Camp
1004(a)(19)	Tower Harbor, Tower, Minnesota	Oberstar
1004(a)(19)	Tower Harbor, Tower, Minnesota	Coleman
1004(a)(19)	Tower Harbor, Tower, Minnesota	Klobuchar

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1004(a)(20)	Olcott Harbor, Olcott, New York	Slaughter
1004(a)(21)	Milwaukee Harbor, Wisconsin	Kohl
1005(01)	Ballona Creek, Los Angeles County, California	Harman
1005(02)	Ballona Lagoon Tide Gates, Marina Del Ray, California	Harman
1005(03)	Ft. George Inlet, Duval County, Florida	Crenshaw
1005(03)	Ft. George Inlet, Duval County, Florida	Brown, C.
1005(04)	Rathbun Lake, Iowa	Boswell
1005(05)	Smithville Lake, Missouri	Graves
1005(06)	Delaware Bay, New Jersey and Delaware	LoBiondo
1005(07)	Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania	Peterson, J.
1006(a)(01)	Cypress Creek, Montgomery, Alabama	Rogers, Mike D.
1006(a)(02)	Black Lake, Alaska	Stevens
1006(a)(02)	Black Lake, Alaska	Murkowski
1006(a)(02)	Black Lake, Alaska	Young, D.
1006(a)(03)	Ben Lomond Dam, Santa Cruz, California	Eshoo
1006(a)(04)	Dockweiler Bluffs, Los Angeles County, California	Harman
1006(a)(05)	Salt River, California	Thompson
1006(a)(06)	San Diego River, California	Boxer
1006(a)(06)	Santa Rosa Creek, Santa Rosa, California	Miller, George
1006(a)(06)	Santa Rosa Creek, Santa Rosa, California	Woolsey
1006(a)(06)	Santa Rosa Creek, Santa Rosa, California	Tauscher
1006(a)(07)	Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel and Lower San Joaquin River, California	McNerney
1006(a)(09)	Suisun Marsh, San Pablo Bay, California	Boxer
1006(a)(10)	Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, California	Filner
1006(a)(11)	Biscayne Bay, Florida	Ros-Lehtinen
1006(a)(12)	Clam Bayou and Dinkins Bayou, Sanibel Island, Florida	Mack
1006(a)(13)	Mountain Park, Georgia	Chambliss
1006(a)(13)	Mountain Park, Georgia	Isakson
1006(a)(14)	Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama	Westmoreland
1006(a)(14)	Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama	Rogers, Mike D.
1006(a)(14)	Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama	Bishop, S.
1006(a)(14)	Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama	Gingrey
1006(a)(14)	Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama	Chambliss
1006(a)(14)	Chattahoochee Fall Line, Georgia and Alabama	Isakson
1006(a)(15)	Longwood Cove, Gainesville, Georgia	Deal
1006(a)(16)	City Park, University Lakes, Louisiana	Baker
1006(a)(17)	Lawrence Gateway, Massachusetts	Kerry
1006(a)(17)	Lawrence Gateway, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1006(a)(18)	Millford Pond, Milford, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1006(a)(19)	Mill Pond, Littleton, Massachusetts	Kerry

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1006(a)(19)	Mill Pond, Littleton, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1006(a)(19)	Millford Pond, Milford, Massachusetts	Kerry
1006(a)(19)	Mill Pond, Littleton, Massachusetts	[Meehan]
1006(a)(20)	Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts	Lynch
1006(a)(20)	Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts	Kerry
1006(a)(20)	Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
1006(a)(21)	Clinton River, Michigan	Stabenow
1006(a)(21)	Clinton River, Michigan	Levin, C.
1006(a)(22)	Kalamazoo River Watershed, Battle Creek, Michigan	Walberg
1006(a)(23)	Rush Lake, Minnesota	Oberstar
1006(a)(24)	South Fork of the Crow River, Hutchinson, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
1006(a)(25)	St. Louis, Missouri	Clay
1006(a)(25)	St. Louis, Missouri	Carnahan
1006(a)(26)	Mobley Dam, Tongue River, Montana	Baucus
1006(a)(27)	S and H Dam, Tongue River, Montana	Baucus
1006(a)(28)	Vandalia Dam, Milk River, Montana	Baucus
1006(a)(29)	Truckee River, Reno, Nevada	Heller
1006(a)(30)	Grover's Mill Pond, New Jersey	Holt
1006(a)(31)	Caldwell County, North Carolina	Burr
1006(a)(32)	Mecklenburg County, North Carolina	Burr
1006(a)(33)	Dugway Creek, Bratenahl, Ohio	Jones, S.
1006(a)(34)	Johnson Creek, Gresham, Oregon	Smith
1006(a)(34)	Johnson Creek, Gresham, Oregon	Blumenauer
1006(a)(34)	Johnson Creek, Gresham, Oregon	Wyden
1006(a)(35)	Beaver Creek, Beaver and Salem, Pennsylvania	Peterson, J.
1006(a)(36)	Cementon Dam, Lehigh River, Pennsylvania	Dent
1006(a)(37)	Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
1006(a)(38)	Saucon Creek, Northampton County, Pennsylvania	Dent
1006(a)(39)	Stillwater Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania	Dent
1006(a)(40)	Blackstone River, Rhode Island	Kennedy, P.
1006(a)(40)	Blackstone River, Rhode Island	Whitehouse
1006(a)(40)	Blackstone River, Rhode Island	Reed
1006(a)(41)	Wilson Branch, Cheraw, South Carolina	Spratt
1006(a)(42)	White River, Bethel, Vermont	Welch
1006(a)(43)	College Lake, Lynchburg, Virginia	Warner
1007(01)	Nelson Lagoon, Alaska	Young, D.
1007(02)	Nicholas Canyon, Los Angeles, California	Boxer
1007(03)	Sanibel Island, Florida	Mack
1007(04)	Apra Harbor, Guam	Clinton
1007(04)	Apra Harbor, Guam	Bordallo
1007(04)	Apra Harbor, Guam	Lautenberg

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
1007(04)	Apra Harbor, Guam	Menendez
1007(04)	Apra Harbor, Guam	Schumer
1007(05)	Piti, Cabras Island, Guam	Menendez
1007(05)	Piti, Cabras Island, Guam	Lautenberg
1007(05)	Piti, Cabras Island, Guam	Schumer
1007(05)	Piti, Cabras Island, Guam	Clinton
1007(05)	Piti, Cabras Island, Guam	Bordallo
1007(06)	Narrows and Gravesend Bay, Upper New York Bay, Brooklyn, New York	Fossella
1007(07)	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pennsylvania	Schwartz
1007(07)	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pennsylvania	Brady
1007(08)	Port Aransas, Texas	Ortiz
1008	Kowawese Unique Area and Hudson River	Hall, J.
1009(01)	Tybee Island, Georgia	Kingston
1009(01)	Tybee Island, Georgia	Isakson
1009(01)	Tybee Island, Georgia	Chambliss
1009(02)	Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana	Lugar
1009(02)	Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana	Bayh
1009(02)	Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana	Visclosky
1010	Small Projects for Aquatic Plant Control	Nelson
2010(a)(06)	Tuscarawas River Basin, Ohio	Sutton
2010(a)(07)	Sauk River Basin, Snohomish and Skagit Counties, Washington	Larsen
2010(a)(08)	Niagara River Basin, New York	Slaughter
2010(a)(09)	Genesee River Basin, New York	Slaughter
2010(a)(10)	White River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Berry
2010(a)(10)	White River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Snyder
2014(20)	Kinkaid Lake, Jackson County, Illinois	Costello
2014(21)	McCarter Pond, Borough of Fair Haven, New Jersey	Holt
2014(22)	Rogers Pond, Franklin Township, New Jersey	Holt
2014(23)	Greenwood Lake, New York and New Jersey	Hall, J.
2014(24)	Lake Rodgers, Creedmoor, North Carolina	Cole
2014(24)	Lake Rodgers, Creedmoor, North Carolina	Miller, B.
2014(25)	Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota	Conrad
2014(26)	Lake Luxembourg, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
2014(27)	Lake Fairlee, Vermont	Sanders
2014(28)	Lake Morley, Vermont	Sanders
2019(b)(01)	St. John's Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri	Emerson
2019(b)(01)	St. John's Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri	Bond
2019(b)(02)	Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas	Cuellar
2019(b)(03)	West Virginia and Pennsylvania Projects	Murtha
2028(a)(01)	Support of the Army Civil Works Program	Duncan

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
2028(a)(02)	Support of the Army Civil Works Program	Costello
2028(a)(03)	Support of the Army Civil Works Program	Johnson, E.B.
2037(f)(01)	Little Rock Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas	Snyder
2037(f)(02)	Fletcher Cove, California	Boxer
2037(f)(03)	Egmont Key, Florida	Castor
2037(f)(04)	Calcasieu Ship Channel, Louisiana	Boustany
2037(f)(05)	Delaware River Estuary, New Jersey and Pennsylvania	Menendez
2037(f)(05)	Delaware River Estuary, New Jersey and Pennsylvania	Lautenberg
2037(f)(06)	Fire Island Inlet, Suffolk County, New York	Clinton
2037(f)(07)	Smith Point Pavilion and TWA Memorial, Brookhaven, New York	Bishop, T.
2037(f)(08)	Morehead City, North Carolina	Jones, W.
2037(f)(09)	Toledo Harbor, Lucas County, Ohio	Voinovich
2037(f)(10)	Galveston Bay, Texas	Paul
2037(f)(11)	Benson Beach, Washington	Baird
3001	Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama	Shelby
3002	Cook Inlet, Alaska	Young, D.
3003	King Cove Harbor, Alaska	Young, D.
3004	Seward Harbor, Alaska	Murkowski
3004	Seward Harbor, Alaska	Stevens
3005	Sitka, Alaska	Young, D.
3005	Sitka, Alaska	Stevens
3005	Sitka, Alaska	Murkowski
3006	Tatitlek, Alaska	Young, D.
3007	Rio De Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona	Renzi
3007	Rio De Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona	Kyl
3008	Nogales Wash and Tributaries Flood Control Project, Arizona	Kyl
3009	Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona	Kyl
3010	Osceola Harbor, Arkansas	Pryor
3010	Osceola Harbor, Arkansas	Lincoln
3010	Osceola Harbor, Arkansas	Berry
3011	St. Francis Basin River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Berry
3011	St. Francis Basin River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Berry
3011	St. Francis Basin River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Lincoln
3011	St. Francis Basin River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Pryor
3012	Pine Mountain Dam, Arkansas	Boozman
3012	Pine Mountain Dam, Arkansas	Pryor
3012	Pine Mountain Dam, Arkansas	Lincoln
3013	Red-Ouachita River Basin Levees, Arkansas and Louisiana	Lincoln
3013	Red-Ouachita River Basin Levees, Arkansas and Louisiana	Pryor
3014	Cache Creek Basin, California	Boxer



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3015	Calfed Stability Program, California	Boxer
3016	Compton Creek, California	[Millender-McDonald]
3017	Grayson Creek/Murderer's Creek, California	Miller, George
3017	Grayson Creek/Murderer's Creek, California	Boxer
3017	Grayson Creek/Murderer's Creek, California	Tauscher
3018	Hamilton Airfield, California	Tauscher
3018	Hamilton Airfield, California	Miller, George
3018	Hamilton Airfield, California	Boxer
3019	John F. Baldwin Ship Channel and Stockton Ship Channel, California	McNerney
3020	Kaweah River, California	Nunes
3021	Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California	Miller, George
3021	Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California	Tauscher
3021	Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California	Woolsey
3021	Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California	Boxer
3022	Llagas Creek, California	Honda
3022	Llagas Creek, California	Lofgren
3022	Llagas Creek, California	McNerney
3022	Llagas Creek, California	Boxer
3022	Llagas Creek, California	Eshoo
3023	Magpie Creek, California	Matsui
3023	Magpie Creek, California	Boxer
3024	Pacific Flyway Center, California	Thompson
3025	Petaluma River, Petaluma, California	Boxer
3026	Pinole Creek, California	Tauscher
3026	Pinole Creek, California	Miller, George
3027	Prado Dam, California	Calvert
3027	Prado Dam, California	Campbell
3027	Prado Dam, California	Sanchez, Loretta
3027	Prado Dam, California	Miller, Gary
3028	Redwood City Navigation Channel, California	Eshoo
3028	Redwood City Navigation Channel, California	Boxer
3029	Sacramento and American Rivers Flood Control, California	Matsui
3029	Sacramento and American Rivers Flood Control, California	Boxer
3029	Sacramento and American Rivers Flood Control, California	Feinstein
3029	Sacramento and American Rivers Flood Control, California	Matsui
3030	Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel, California	Thompson
3031	Sacramento River Bank Protection, California	Feinstein
3031	Sacramento River Bank Protection, California	Boxer
3032	Salton Sea Restoration Project	Boxer



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3032	Salton Sea Restoration Project	Bono
3032	Salton Sea Restoration Project	Filner
3033	Santa Ana River Mainstem, California	Miller, G.
3033	Santa Ana River Mainstem, California	Boxer
3034	Santa Barbara Streams, Lower Mission Creek, California	Boxer
3034	Santa Barbara Streams, Lower Mission Creek, California	Capps
3035	Santa Cruz Harbor, California	Farr
3036	Seven Oaks Dam, California	Boxer
3036	Seven Oaks Dam, California	Calvert
3037	Upper Guadalupe River, California	Boxer
3037	Upper Guadalupe River, California	Lofgren
3037	Upper Guadalupe River, California	Eshoo
3037	Upper Guadalupe River, California	Honda
3038	Walnut Creek Channel, California	Miller, George
3038	Walnut Creek Channel, California	Boxer
3038	Walnut Creek Channel, California	Tauscher
3039	Wildcat/San Pablo Creek/Phase I, California	Tauscher
3039	Wildcat/San Pablo Creek/Phase I, California	Miller, George
3040	Wildcat/San Pablo Creek/Phase II, California	Miller, George
3040	Wildcat/San Pablo Creek/Phase II, California	Tauscher
3040	Wildcat/San Pablo Creek/Phase II, California	Boxer
3041	Yuba River Basin Project, California	Herger
3041	Yuba River Basin Project, California	Boxer
3042	South Platte River Basin, Colorado	Tancredo
3042	South Platte River Basin, Colorado	DeGette
3043	Intercoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland	Gilchrest
3043	Intercoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland	Castle
3044	St. George's Bridge, Delaware	Carper
3044	St. George's Bridge, Delaware	Biden
3044	St. George's Bridge, Delaware	Castle
3045	Brevard County, Florida	Nelson
3045	Brevard County, Florida	Martinez
3045	Brevard County, Florida	Weldon, D.
3046	Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida	Martinez
3046	Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida	Klein
3046	Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida	Nelson
3047	Canaveral Harbor, Florida	Weldon, D.
3047	Canaveral Harbor, Florida	Nelson
3048	Gasparilla & Estero Islands, Florida	Mack
3048	Gasparilla & Estero Islands, Florida	Nelson

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3049	Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida	Buchanan
3049	Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida	Nelson
3049	Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida	Martinez
3050	Peanut Island, Florida	Klein
3051	Port Sutton, Florida	Martinez
3051	Port Sutton, Florida	Nelson
3052	Tampa Harbor-Big Bend Channel, Florida	Nelson
3052	Tampa Harbor-Big Bend Channel, Florida	Castor
3053	Tampa Harbor Cut B, Florida	Martinez
3053	Tampa Harbor Cut B, Florida	Castor
3053	Tampa Harbor Cut B, Florida	Putnam
3053	Tampa Harbor Cut B, Florida	Nelson
3054	Allatoona Lake, Georgia	Gingrey
3054	Allatoona Lake, Georgia	Price
3054	Allatoona Lake, Georgia	Isakson
3054	Allatoona Lake, Georgia	Chambliss
3055	Latham River, Glynn County, Georgia	Kingston
3056	Dworshak Reservoir Improvements, Idaho	Craig
3056	Dworshak Reservoir Improvements, Idaho	Simpson
3056	Dworshak Reservoir Improvements, Idaho	Crapo
3057	Little Wood River, Gooding, Idaho	Craig
3057	Little Wood River, Gooding, Idaho	Crapo
3058	Beardstown Community Boat Harbor, Beardstown, Illinois	LaHood
3058	Beardstown Community Boat Harbor, Beardstown, Illinois	Durbin
3059	Cache River Levee, Illinois	Obama
3059	Cache River Levee, Illinois	Durbin
3059	Cache River Levee, Illinois	Shimkus
3060	Chicago River, Illinois	Davis, D.
3060	Chicago River, Illinois	Obama
3060	Chicago River, Illinois	Durbin
3061	Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal, Illinois	Stupak
3061	Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal, Illinois	Kirk
3061	Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal, Illinois	McCotter
3061	Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal, Illinois	Gutierrez
3061	Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal, Illinois	Biggert
3061	Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal, Illinois	Dingell
3062	Emiquon, Illinois	Durbin
3062	Emiquon, Illinois	Hare
3063	LaSalle, Illinois	Weller
3064	Spunky Bottom, Illinois	Obama
3064	Spunky Bottom, Illinois	Durbin

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3064	Spunky Bottom, Illinois	LaHood
3065	Cedar Lake, Indiana	Lugar
3066	Koontz Lake, Indiana	Donnelly
3066	Koontz Lake, Indiana	Bayh
3066	Koontz Lake, Indiana	Lugar
3067	White River, Indiana	Carson, J.
3067	White River, Indiana	Lugar
3067	White River, Indiana	Bayh
3068	Des Moines River and Greenbelt, Iowa	Harkin
3068	Des Moines River and Greenbelt, Iowa	Boswell
3069	Perry Creek, Iowa	Harkin
3070	Rathbun Lake, Iowa	Grassley
3071	Hickman Bluff Stabilization, Kentucky	McConnell
3072	Mcalpine Lock And Dam, Kentucky And Indiana	McConnell
3072	Mcalpine Lock And Dam, Kentucky And Indiana	Yarmouth
3073	Prestonsburg, Kentucky	Rogers, H.
3074	Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed	Baker
3074	Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed	Landrieu
3074	Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed	Vitter
3075	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana	Boustany
3075	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana	Vitter
3075	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana	Landrieu
3075(c)	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana (Town of Melville)	Boustany
3076	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Regional Visitors Center, Louisiana	Vitter
3076	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Regional Visitors Center, Louisiana	Landrieu
3076	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Regional Visitors Center, Louisiana	Boustany
3077	Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, Louisiana	Baker
3078	Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana	Baker
3079	Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana	Vitter
3079	Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana	Landrieu
3080	Red River (J. Bennett Johnston) Waterway, Louisiana	Landrieu
3080	Red River (J. Bennett Johnston) Waterway, Louisiana	McCrery
3080	Red River (J. Bennett Johnston) Waterway, Louisiana	Jindal
3080	Red River (J. Bennett Johnston) Waterway, Louisiana	Vitter
3081	Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana	Melancon

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3082	Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet Relocation Assistance, Louisiana	Vitter
3082	Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet Relocation Assistance, Louisiana	Landrieu
3083	Violet, Louisiana	Landrieu
3083	Violet, Louisiana	Cochran
3083	Violet, Louisiana	Lott
3084	West Bank of the Mississippi River (East of Harvey Canal), Louisiana	Melancon
3084	West Bank of the Mississippi River (East of Harvey Canal), Louisiana	Jindal
3085	Camp Ellis, Saco, Maine	Allen
3085	Camp Ellis, Saco, Maine	Snowe
3085	Camp Ellis, Saco, Maine	Collins
3086	Cumberland, Maryland	Mikulski
3086	Cumberland, Maryland	Cardin
3087	Poplar Island, Maryland	Ruppersburger
3087	Poplar Island, Maryland	Hoyer
3087	Poplar Island, Maryland	Sarbanes
3087	Poplar Island, Maryland	Cummings
3087	Poplar Island, Maryland	Mikulski
3087	Poplar Island, Maryland	Cardin
3088	Detroit River Shoreline, Detroit, Michigan	Kilpatrick
3088	Detroit River Shoreline, Detroit, Michigan	Levin, C.
3088	Detroit River Shoreline, Detroit, Michigan	Stabenow
3089	St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair Michigan	Levin, S.
3089	St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair Michigan	Levin, C.
3089	St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, Michigan	Stabenow
3089	St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, Michigan	Miller, C.
3090	St. Joseph Harbor, Michigan	Upton
3091	Sault Saint Marie, Michigan	Stupak
3091	Sault Saint Marie, Michigan	Oberstar
3092	Ada, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
3092	Ada, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3093	Duluth Harbor, McQuade Road, Minnesota	Coleman
3093	Duluth Harbor, McQuade Road, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3093	Duluth Harbor, McQuade Road, Minnesota	Oberstar
3094	Grand Marais, Minnesota	Oberstar
3094	Grand Marais, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3095	Grand Portage Harbor, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3095	Grand Portage Harbor, Minnesota	Oberstar
3096	Granite Falls, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
3097	Knife River Harbor, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3097	Knife River Harbor, Minnesota	Oberstar

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3098	Red Lake River, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
3099	Silver Bay, Minnesota	Oberstar
3099	Silver Bay, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3100	Taconite Harbor, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3100	Taconite Harbor, Minnesota	Oberstar
3101	Two Harbors, Minnesota	Oberstar
3101	Two Harbors, Minnesota	Klobuchar
3101	Two Harbors, Minnesota	Coleman
3102	Deer Island, Harrison County, Mississippi	Taylor
3103	Jackson, Mississippi	Thompson, B.
3104	Pearl River Basin, Mississippi	Lott
3104	Pearl River Basin, Mississippi	Cochran
3104	Pearl River Basin, Mississippi	Pickering
3105	Festus and Crystal City, Missouri	Carnahan
3106	L-15 Levee, Missouri	Bond
3106	L-15 Levee, Missouri	Akin
3106	L-15 Levee, Missouri	McCaskill
3107	Monarch-Chesterfield, Missouri	Akin
3108	River Des Peres, Missouri	Carnahan
3109	Lower Yellowstone Project, Montana	Tester
3109	Lower Yellowstone Project, Montana	Baucus
3110	Yellowstone River and Tributaries, Montana and North Dakota	Baucus
3110	Yellowstone River and Tributaries, Montana and North Dakota	Tester
3111	Antelope Creek, Nebraska	Nelson
3111	Antelope Creek, Nebraska	Fortenberry
3111	Antelope Creek, Nebraska	Hagel
3112	Sand Creek Watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska	Hagel
3112	Sand Creek Watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska	Fortenberry
3112	Sand Creek Watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska	Nelson
3113	Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska	Hagel
3113	Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska	Nelson
3113	Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska	Fortenberry
3114	Lower Truckee River, McCarran Ranch, Nevada	Ensign
3115	Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey	LoBiondo
3116	Passaic River Basin Flood Management, New Jersey	Frelinghuysen
3117	Cooperative Agreements, New Mexico	Udall, T.
3117	Cooperative Agreements, New Mexico	Domenici
3117	Cooperative Agreements, New Mexico	Bingaman
3118	Middle Rio Grande Restoration, New Mexico	Domenici
3118	Middle Rio Grande Restoration, New Mexico	Bingaman
3119	Buffalo Harbor, New York	Higgins

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3120	Long Island Sound Oyster Restoration, New York and Connecticut	Lieberman
3120	Long Island Sound Oyster Restoration, New York and Connecticut	Dodd
3120	Long Island Sound Oyster Restoration, New York and Connecticut	Clinton
3121	Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers Watershed Management, New York	Schumer
3121	Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers Watershed Management, New York	Clinton
3121(a)(09)	Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts	Delahunt
3121(a)(09)	Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts	Kerry
3121(a)(09)	Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
3122	Orchard Beach, Bronx	Serrano
3122	Orchard Beach, Bronx	Crowley
3122	Orchard Beach, Bronx	Clinton
3123	Port of New York and New Jersey, New York and New Jersey	Sires
3123	Arkansas	Inhofe
3124	New York State Canal System	Slaughter
3124	New York State Canal System	Clinton
3124	New York State Canal System	Higgins
3125	Susquehanna River and Upper Delaware River Watershed Management, New York	Clinton
3126	Missouri River Restoration, North Dakota	Conrad
3127	Wahepton, North Dakota	Conrad
3128	Ohio	Voinovich
3129	Lower Girard Lake Dam, Ohio	Ryan, T.
3129	Lower Girard Lake Dam, Ohio	Voinovich
3130	Mahoning River, Ohio	Ryan, T.
3131	Arcadia Lake, Oklahoma	Fallin
3131	Arcadia Lake, Oklahoma	Inhofe
3132	Arkansas River Corridor, Oklahoma	Inhofe
3133	Lake Eufaula, Oklahoma	Inhofe
3134	Oklahoma Lakes Demonstration Program, Oklahoma	Inhofe
3135	Ottawa County, Oklahoma	Inhofe
3136	Red River Chloride Control, Oklahoma and Texas	Inhofe
3137	Waurika Lake, Oklahoma	Cole
3137	Waurika Lake, Oklahoma	Inhofe
3138	Upper Willamette River Watershed Ecosystem Restoration, Oregon	Wyden
3138	Upper Willamette River Watershed Ecosystem Restoration, Oregon	Smith
3139	Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	Schwartz



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3139	Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	Castle
3139	Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	Saxton
3139	Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	Andrews, R.
3139	Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	LoBiondo
3140	Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania	Shuster
3141	Sheraden Park Stream & Chartiers Creek, Allegheny County	Doyle
3142	Solomon's Creek, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania	Specter
3142	Solomon's Creek, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania	Casey
3142	Solomon's Creek, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania	Kanjorski
3143	South Central Pennsylvania	Murtha
3143	South Central Pennsylvania	Shuster
3144	Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania	Specter
3144	Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania	Casey
3144	Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania	Kanjorski
3145	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	Whitehouse
3145	Missouri River Restoration, South Dakota	Thune
3145	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	Reed
3147	Cedar Bayou, Texas	Cornyn
3147	Cedar Bayou, Texas	Hutchison
3147	Cedar Bayou, Texas	Paul
3148	Freeport Harbor, Texas	Hutchison
3148	Freeport Harbor, Texas	Cornyn
3148	Freeport Harbor, Texas	Paul
3149	Lake Kemp, Texas	Cornyn
3149	Lake Kemp, Texas	Hutchison
3149	Lake Kemp, Texas	Thornberry
3150	Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas	Hinojosa
3151	North Padre Island, Texas	Ortiz
3152	Pat Mayse Lake, Texas	Hall, R.
3153	Proctor Lake, Texas	Conaway
3154	San Antonio Channel, Texas	Gonzalez
3155	Connecticut River Restoration, Vermont	Sanders
3156	Dam Remediation, Vermont	Sanders
3157	Lake Champlain Eurasian Milfoil, Water Chestnut, and Other Nonnative Plant Control, Vermont	Sanders
3158	Upper Connecticut River Basin Wetland Restoration, Vermont and New Hampshire	Sanders
3159	Upper Connecticut River Basin Ecosystem Restoration, Vermont and New Hampshire	Sanders
3160	Lake Champlain Watershed, Vermont and New York	Sanders
3160	Lake Champlain Watershed, Vermont and New York	Clinton
3161	Sandbridge Beach, Virginia Beach, Virginia	Warner

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3162	Tangier Island Seawall, Virginia	Drake
3162	Tangier Island Seawall, Virginia	Warner
3162	Tangier Island Seawall, Virginia	Webb
3163	McNary Lock and Dam, McNary National Wildlife Refuge, Washington and Idaho	Craig
3163	Duwamish/Green, Washington	Reichert
3163	McNary Lock and Dam, McNary National Wildlife Refuge, Washington and Idaho	Cantwell
3163	McNary Lock and Dam, McNary National Wildlife Refuge, Washington and Idaho	Crapo
3163	McNary Lock and Dam, McNary National Wildlife Refuge, Washington and Idaho	Murray
3164	Snake River Project, Washington and Idaho	Murray
3164	Snake River Project, Washington and Idaho	Craig
3164	Snake River Project, Washington and Idaho	Crapo
3164	Snake River Project, Washington and Idaho	Cantwell
3166	Yakima River, Port of Sunnyside, Washington	Hastings, D.
3167	Bluestone Lake, Ohio River Basin, West Virginia	Rahall
3168	Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia	Rahall
3169	Lesage/Greenbottom Swamp, West Virginia	Rahall
3170	Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia	Byrd
3170	Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia	Rahall
3171	McDowell County, West Virginia	Byrd
3172	Parkersburg, West Virginia	Mollohan
3173	Green Bay Harbor, Green Bay, Wisconsin	Kohl
3174	Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin	Petri
3174	Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin	Kohl
3175	Mississippi River Headwaters Reservoirs	Klobuchar
3175	Mississippi River Headwaters Reservoirs	Oberstar
3176	Upper Basin of the Missouri River	Hagel
3176	Upper Basin of the Missouri River	Nelson
3176	Upper Basin of the Missouri River	Thune
3176	Upper Basin of the Missouri River	Baucus
3177	Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program	LaHood
3177	Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program	Harkin
3178	Upper Ohio River and Tributaries Navigation System New Technology Pilot Program	Specter
3178	Upper Ohio River and Tributaries Navigation System New Technology Pilot Program	Casey
3179(a)(01)	Continuation of Project Authorizations	Thompson
3179(a)(02)	Continuation of Project Authorizations	Bordallo

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3179(a)(03)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel, Maryland and Virginia	Mikulski
3179(a)(03)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel, Maryland and Virginia	Cardin
3179(a)(03)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel, Maryland and Virginia	Cummings
3179(a)(04)	Continuation of Project Authorizations	Frank
3179(a)(04)	Continuation of Project Authorizations	McGovern
3179(a)(05)	Ecorse Creek, Wayne County, Michigan	Dingell
3179(a)(05)	Ecorse Creek, Wayne County, Michigan	Conyers
3179(a)(05)	Ecorse Creek, Wayne County, Michigan	McCotter
3179(a)(05)	Ecorse Creek, Wayne County, Michigan	Stabenow
3179(a)(05)	Ecorse Creek, Wayne County, Michigan	Levin, C.
3180(01)	Menominee Harbor and River, Michigan and Wisconsin	Stupak
3180(02)	Hearding Island Inlet, Duluth Harbor, Minnesota	Oberstar
3180(03)	Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin	Kohl
3180(03)	Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin	Petri
3181(a)(01)	Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut	Shays
3181(a)(02)	Mystic River, Connecticut	Courtney
3181(a)(03)	Norwalk Harbor, Connecticut	Lieberman
3181(a)(03)	Norwalk Harbor, Connecticut	Biden
3181(a)(04)	Rockland Harbor, Maine	Snowe
3181(a)(04)	Rockland Harbor, Maine	Allen
3181(a)(05)	Rockport Harbor, Maine	Snowe
3181(a)(06)	Falmouth Harbor, Massachusetts	Delahunt
3181(a)(07)	Island End River, Massachusetts	Capuano
3181(a)(08)	City Waterway, Tacoma, Washington	Dicks
3181(a)(10)	Whatcom Creek Waterway, Bellingham, Washington	Cantwell
3181(a)(10)	Whatcom Creek Waterway, Bellingham, Washington	Larsen
3181(a)(10)	Whatcom Creek Waterway, Bellingham, Washington	Byrd
3181(a)(11)	Oconto Harbor, Wisconsin	Kohl
3181(b)	Anchorage Area, New London Harbor, Connecticut	Courtney
3181(b)	Anchorage Area, New London Harbor, Connecticut	Lieberman
3181(b)	Anchorage Area, New London Harbor, Connecticut	Dodd
3181(c)	Southport Harbor, Fairfield, Connecticut	Shays
3181(d)	Saco River, Maine	Allen
3181(d)	Saco River, Maine	Snowe
3181(e)	Union River, Maine	Snowe
3181(e)	Union River, Maine	Michaud
3181(f)	Mystic River, Massachusetts	Markey
3181(g)	Rivercenter, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Brady
3182(a)(01)	St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Berry
3182(a)(01)	St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Pryor
3182(a)(01)	St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri	Lincoln

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
3182(b)	Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, California	Stark
3182(b)	Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, California	Boxer
3182(c)	Milford, Kansas	Boyda
3182(c)	Milford, Kansas	Brownback
3182(c)	Milford, Kansas	Roberts
3182(d)	Strawn Cemetary, John Redmond Lake, Kansas	Roberts
3182(d)	Strawn Cemetary, John Redmond Lake, Kansas	Brownback
3182(e)	Pike County, Missouri	McCaskill
3182(e)	Pike County, Missouri	Hulshof
3182(e)	Pike County, Missouri	Bond
3182(f)	Union Lake, Missouri	Bond
3182(f)	Union Lake, Missouri	McCaskill
3182(g)	Boardman, Oregon	Walden
3182(h)	Lookout Point Project, Lowell, Oregon	Wyden
3182(h)	Lookout Point Project, Lowell, Oregon	Smith
3182(h)	Lookout Point Project, Lowell, Oregon	DeFazio
3182(i)	Richard B. Russell Lake, South Carolina	Graham
3182(i)	Richard B. Russell Lake, South Carolina	Barrett
3182(j)	Denison, Texas	Hall, R.
3182(j)	Denison, Texas	Cornyn
3182(j)	Denison, Texas	Hutchison
3183(a)	Idaho	Craig
3183(a)	Idaho	Simpson
3183(a)	Idaho	Crapo
3183(b)	Lake Texoma, Oklahoma	Fallin
3183(b)	Lake Taxoma, Oklahoma	Cole
3183(b)	Lake Texoma, Oklahoma	Inhofe
3183(c)	Lowell, Oregon	DeFazio
3183(d)	Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee	Cooper
3183(d)	Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee	Alexander
3183(e)	Lower Granite Pool, Washington	Cantwell
3183(e)	Lower Granite Pool, Washington	Murray
3183(f)	Port of Pasco, Washington	Murray
3183(f)	Port of Pasco, Washington	Cantwell
3183(f)	Port of Pasco, Washington	Hastings, D.
4001	John Glenn Great Lakes Basin Program	McCotter
4001	John Glenn Great Lakes Basin Program	Dingell
4002	Lake Erie Dredged Material Disposal Sites	Reynolds
4003	Southwestern United States Drought Study	Berkley
4004	Delaware River	Murphy, P.
4005	Eurasian Milfoil	Sanders

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
4006	Fire Island, Alaska	Young, D.
4007	Knik Arm, Cook Inlet, Alaska	Young, D.
4008	Kuskokwim River, Alaska	Young, D.
4009	Nome Harbor, Alaska	Young, D.
4010	St. George Harbor, Alaska	Stevens
4010	St. George Harbor, Alaska	Young, D.
4011	Susitna River, Alaska	Young, D.
4012	Valdez, Alaska	Young, D.
4012	Valdez, Alaska	Stevens
4012	Valdez, Alaska	Murkowski
4013	Gila Bend, Maricopa, Arizona	Grijalva
4014	Searcy County, Arkansas	Berry
4015	Aliso Creek, California	Campbell
4016	Fresno, Kings, and Kern Counties, California	Costa
4017	Fruitville Avenue Railroad Bridge, Alameda, California	Boxer
4017	Fruitville Avenue Railroad Bridge, Alameda, California	Stark
4018	Los Angeles River Revitalization Study, California	Roybal-Allard
4018	Los Angeles River Revitalization Study, California	Boxer
4019	Lytle Creek, Rialto, California	Baca
4020	Mokelumne River, San Joaquin County, California	McNerney
4021	Orick, California	Thompson
4022	Shoreline Study, Oceanside, California	Boxer
4023	Rialto, Fontana and Colton Counties	Baca
4024	Sacramento River, California	Herger
4025	San Diego County, California	Hunter
4026	San Francisco Bay, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California	Tauscher
4026	San Francisco Bay, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California	Boxer
4026	San Francisco Bay, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California	Miller, George
4026	San Francisco Bay, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California	McNerney
4027	South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, California	Honda
4027	South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, California	Lofgren
4027	South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, California	Eshoo
4027	South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, California	Boxer
4028	Twentynine Palms, California	Lewis, J.
4029	Yucca Valley, California	Lewis, J.
4030	Selenium Study, California	Salazar
4030	Selenium Study, California	Allard
4031	Delaware and Christina River and Shellpot Creek, Wilmington, Delaware	Castle
4032	Delaware Inland Bays and Tributaries and Atlantic Coast, Delaware	Carper
4032	Delaware Inland Bays and Tributaries and Atlantic Coast,	Biden

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
	Delaware	
4033	Collier County Beaches, Florida	Mack
4034	Lower St. John's River, Florida	Brown, C.
4034	Lower St. John's River, Florida	Crenshaw
4035	Herbert Hoover Dike Supplemental Major Rehabilitation Report, Florida	Martinez
4035	Herbert Hoover Dike Supplemental Major Rehabilitation Report, Florida	Nelson
4036	Vanderbilt Beach Lagoon, Florida	Mack
4037	Meriwether County, Georgia	Westmoreland
4038	Boise River, Idaho	Crapo
4038	Boise River, Idaho	Simpson
4039	Ballard's Island Side Channel, Illinois	Weller
4040	Chicago, Illinois	Obama
4040	Chicago, Illinois	Durbin
4041	Salem, Indiana	Hill
4042	Buckhorn Lake, Kentucky	Rogers, H.
4043	Dewey Lake, Kentucky	Rogers, H.
4044	Louisville, Kentucky	Yarmouth
4045	Vidalia Port, Louisiana	Landrieu
4045	Vidalia Port, Louisiana	Vitter
4046	Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts and Rhode Island	McGovern
4046	Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts and Rhode Island	Kennedy, T.
4046	Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts and Rhode Island	Kerry
4047	Clinton River, Michigan	Knollenberg
4047	Walla Walla River Basin, Oregon	Walden
4048	Hamburg and Green Oak Townships, Michigan	Rogers, M.
4049	Lake Erie at Luna Pier, Michigan	Levin, C.
4049	Lake Erie at Luna Pier, Michigan	Stabenow
4049	Lake Erie at Luna Pier, Michigan	Dingell
4050	Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin	Oberstar
4051	Northeast Mississippi	Wicker
4052	Dredged Material Disposal, New Jersey	LoBiondo
4053	Bayonne, New Jersey	Sires
4054	Carteret, New Jersey	Sires
4055	Gloucester County, New Jersey	Andrews, R.
4056	Perth Amboy, New Jersey	Sires
4057	Batavia, New York	Reynolds
4058	Big Sister Creek, Evans, New York	Higgins
4059	Finger Lakes, New York	Arcuri
4060	Lake Erie Shoreline, Buffalo, New York	Higgins
4061	Newtown Creek, New York	Velazquez



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
4062	Niagara River, New York	Slaughter
4063	Shore Parkway Greenway, Brooklyn, New York	Fossella
4064	Upper Delaware River Watershed, New York	Hinchey
4065	Lincoln County, North Carolina	McHenry
4066	Wilkes County, North Carolina	Foxx
4067	Town of Yadkinville, North Carolina	Burr
4067	Town of Yadkinville, North Carolina	Foxx
4068	Flood Damage Reduction, Ohio	Voinovich
4069	Lake Erie, Ohio	Kaptur
4070	Ohio River, Ohio	Voinovich
4070	Ohio River, Ohio	Wilson, C.
4071	Toledo Harbor Dredged Material Placement, Toledo, Ohio	Voinovich
4071	Toledo Harbor Dredged Material Placement, Toledo, Ohio	Kaptur
4072	Toledo Harbor, Maumee River, And Lake Channel Project, Toledo, Ohio	Kaptur
4072	Toledo Harbor, Maumee River, And Lake Channel Project, Toledo, Ohio	Voinovich
4073	Ecosystem Restoration and Fish Passage Improvements, Oregon	DeFazio
4073	Ecosystem Restoration and Fish Passage Improvements, Oregon	Blumenauer
4075	Chartiers Creek Watershed, Pennsylvania	Murphy, T.
4076	Kinzua Dam & Alleghany Reservoir, Pennsylvania	Peterson,J
4077	Western Pennsylvania Flood Damage Reduction	Murtha
4077	Western Pennsylvania Flood Damage Reduction	Altmire
4078	Williamsport, Pennsylvania	Peterson,J
4079	Yardley Borough, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
4080	Rio Valenciano, Juncos, Puerto Rico	Schumer
4080	Rio Valenciano, Juncos, Puerto Rico	Clinton
4080	Rio Valenciano, Juncos, Puerto Rico	Fortuno
4080	Rio Valenciano, Juncos, Puerto Rico	Menendez
4080	Rio Valenciano, Juncos, Puerto Rico	Lautenberg
4081	Woonsocket Local Protection Project, Blackstone River Basin, Rhode Island	Reed
4081	Woonsocket Local Protection Project, Blackstone River Basin, Rhode Island	Whitehouse
4082	Crooked Creek, Bennettsville, South Carolina	Spratt
4083	Broad River, York County, South Carolina	Spratt
4084	Savannah River, South Carolina and Georgia	Isakson
4085	Chattanooga, Tennessee	Wamp
4086	Cleveland, Tennessee	Wamp
4087	Cumberland River, Nashville, Tennessee	Alexander

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
4087	Cumberland River, Nashville, Tennessee	Cooper
4087	Cumberland River, Nashville, Tennessee	Corker
4088	Lewis, Lawrence and Wayne Counties, Tennessee	Blackburn
4089	Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek, Memphis, Tennessee	Blackburn
4090	Abilene, Texas	Neugebauer
4091	Coastal Texas Ecosystem Protection and Restoration, Texas	Ortiz
4091	Coastal Texas Ecosystem Protection and Restoration, Texas	Paul
4092	Port of Galveston, Texas	Cornyn
4092	Port of Galveston, Texas	Hutchison
4092	Port of Galveston, Texas	Paul
4093	Grand County and Moab, Utah	Matheson
4094	Southwestern Utah	Matheson
4095	Ecosystem and Hydropower Generation Dams, Vermont	Sanders
4096	Elliot Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington	McDermott
4096	Elliot Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington	Larsen
4096	Elliot Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington	Murray
4096	Elliot Bay Seawall, Seattle, Washington	Cantwell
4097	Monongahela River Basin, Northern West Virginia	Mollohan
4098	Kenosha Harbor, Wisconsin	Ryan, P.
4099	Johnsonville Dam, Johnsonville, Wisconsin	Kohl
4099	Johnsonville Dam, Johnsonville, Wisconsin	Petri
4100	Wauwatosa, Wisconsin	Moore, G.
4101	Debris Removal	Vitter
4101	Debris Removal	Inhofe
5001(a)(01)	Manatee Harbor Basin, Florida	Buchanan
5001(a)(01)	Manatee Harbor Basin, Florida	Castor
5001(a)(02)	Tampa Harbor, Sparkman Channel and Davis Island, Florida	Nelson
5001(a)(03)	Bayou LaFourche Channel, Port Fourchon	Melancon
5001(a)(03)	West Turning Basin, Canaveral Harbor, Florida	Weldon, D.
5001(a)(04)	Calcasieu River at Devil's Elbow, Louisiana	Boustany
5001(a)(06)	Pidgeon Industrial Harbor, Pidgeon Industrial Park, Memphis Harbor, Tennessee	Blackburn
5001(a)(07)	Houston Ship Channel, Bayport Cruise Channel and Bayport Cruise Turning Basin, Texas	Cornyn
5001(a)(07)	Houston Ship Channel, Bayport Cruise Channel and Bayport Cruise Turning Basin, Texas	Hutchison
5001(a)(08)	Pix Bayou Navigation Channel, Chambers County, Texas	Paul
5001(a)(09)	Jacintoport Channel at Houston Ship Channel, Texas	Hutchison
5001(a)(09)	Jacintoport Channel at Houston Ship Channel, Texas	Cornyn
5001(a)(10)	Racine Harbor, Wisconsin	Ryan, P.
5001(a)(10)	Racine Harbor, Wisconsin	Kohl
5002(d)(01)	Charlotte Harbor watershed, Florida	Buchanan

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5002(d)(02)	Georgia Watershed Assessment Plan	Scott
5002(d)(02)	Georgia Watershed Assessment Plan	Price
5002(d)(03)	Kinkaid Lake, Jaskson County, Illinois	Costello
5002(d)(04)	Amite River River Basin, Louisiana	Baker
5002(d)(05)	East Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana	Baker
5002(d)(06)	Red River Watershed, Louisiana	McCrery
5002(d)(07)	Taunton River Basin, Massachusetts	Lynch
5002(d)(07)	Taunton River Basin, Massachusetts	Kerry
5002(d)(07)	Taunton River Basin, Massachusetts	Kennedy, T.
5002(d)(08)	Marlboro Township, New Jersey	Holt
5002(d)(08)	Marlboro Township, New Jersey	Pallone
5002(d)(09)	Esopus, Plattekill & Rondout Creeks, Greene, Sullivan, and Ulster Counties, New York	Hinchey
5002(d)(10)	Greenwood Lake Watershed, New York and New Jersey	Garrett
5002(d)(10)	Greenwood Lake Watershed, New York and New Jersey	Hall, J.
5002(d)(11)	Long Island Sound Watershed, New York	Bishop, T.
5002(d)(12)	Ramapo River Watershed, New York	Hall, J.
5002(d)(13)	Tuscarawas River Basin, Ohio	Sutton
5002(d)(14)	Western Lake Erie Basin, Ohio	Kaptur
5002(d)(15)	Western Pennsylvania Watershed	Altmire
5002(d)(16)	Otter Creek, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
5002(d)(17)	Unami Creek Watershed, Pennsylvania	Murphy, P.
5002(d)(18)	Sauk River Basin, Washington	Larsen
5003(a)(01)	Fish Creek Dam, Blaine County, Idaho	Simpson
5003(a)(02)	Keith Creek Dam, Rockford, Illinois	Obama
5003(a)(02)	Keith Creek Dam, Rockford, Illinois	Durbin
5003(a)(03)	Mount Zion Mill Pond Dam, Fulton County, Indiana	Lugar
5003(a)(03)	Mount Zion Mill Pond Dam, Fulton County, Indiana	Bayh
5003(a)(04)	Congers Lake Dam, Rocklan County, New York	Clinton
5003(a)(04)	Hamilton Dam, Flint River, Flint, Michigan	Levin, C.
5003(a)(04)	Hamilton Dam, Flint River, Flint, Michigan	Stabenow
5003(a)(04)	Hamilton Dam, Flint River, Flint, Michigan	Kildee
5003(a)(05)	Congers Lake Dam, Rockland County, New York	Clinton
5003(a)(06)	Lake Lucille Dam, New City, New York	Clinton
5003(a)(07)	Peconic River Dams, Town of Riverhead, New York	Clinton
5003(a)(08)	Pine Grove Lakes Dam, Sloatsburg, New York	Clinton
5003(a)(09)	State Dam, Auburn, New York	Arcuri
5003(a)(10)	Whaley Lake, Town of Pawling, New York	Hall, J.
5003(a)(11)	Brightwood Dam, Concord Township, Ohio	Voinovich
5003(a)(12)	Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania	Specter
5003(a)(12)	Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania	Casey

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5003(a)(12)	Ingham Spring Dam, Solebury Township, Pennsylvania	Specter
5003(a)(13)	Leaser Lake Dam, Lehigh County	Dent
5003(a)(14)	Stillwater Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania	Specter
5003(a)(14)	Stillwater Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania	Specter
5003(a)(14)	Stillwater Dam, Monroe County, Pennsylvania	Casey
5003(a)(15)	Wissahickon Dam, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania	Schwartz
5004(b)	Arkansas River Levees	Snyder
5005(a)(29)	Ascension Parish, Louisiana	Melancon
5005(a)(29)	Ascension Parish, Louisiana	Baker
5005(a)(30)	East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana	Baker
5005(a)(31)	Iberville, Louisiana	Baker
5005(a)(32)	Livingston, Louisiana	Baker
5005(a)(33)	Pointe Coupee	Baker
5006(a)(09)	Hidalgo County	Hinojosa
5006(a)(10)	Marana	Grijalva
5006(a)(10)	Marana	Giffords
5006(a)(11)	East Arkansas Enterprise Community	Pryor
5006(a)(11)	East Arkansas Enterprise Community	Lincoln
5006(a)(11)	East Arkansas Enterprise Community, Arkansas	Everett
5006(a)(11)	East Arkansas Enterprise Community	Berry
5006(a)(12)	Desert Hot Springs	Lewis, J.
5006(a)(13)	City of Huntington Beach	Rohrabacher
5006(a)(14)	City of Inglewood	Waters
5006(a)(15)	Los Osos	Capps
5006(a)(16)	Norwalk, California	Napolitano
5006(a)(17)	Park City	Bishop, R.
5007(01)	Whittier, Alaska	Stevens
5007(01)	Whittier, Alaska	Young, D.
5007(02)	Laguna Creek, California	Boxer
5007(03)	Daytona Beach Shore Protection Project	Mica
5007(04)	Flagler Beach Shore Protection Project	Mica
5007(05)	St. Johns County Shore Protection Project	Mica
5007(06)	Chenier Plain, Louisiana	Vitter
5007(06)	Chenier Plain, Louisiana	Boustany
5007(07)	False River	Baker
5007(08)	North River, Peabody	Tierney
5007(08)	North River, Peabody	Kennedy, T.
5007(08)	North River, Peabody	Kerry
5007(09)	Fulmer Creek	Arcuri
5007(10)	Moyer Creek	Arcuri
5007(11)	Steele Creek	Arcuri

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5007(12)	Oriskany Wildlife Management Area, Rome	Arcuri
5007(13)	Whitney Point	Arcuri
5007(14)	Chenango Lake, Chenango County	Arcuri
5008(a)(01)	Little Red River Irrigation District	Pryor
5008(a)(01)	Little Red River Irrigation District	Snyder
5008(a)(01)	Little Red River Irrigation District	Lincoln
5008(a)(02)	Fountain Creek, North of Pueblo, Colorado	Salazar, K.
5008(a)(03)	Egmont Key, Florida	Young, C.W.
5008(a)(03)	Egmont Key, Florida	Castor
5008(a)(04)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	Poe
5008(a)(04)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	Hutchison
5008(a)(04)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	Cornyn
5008(a)(05)	University Lakes, Baton Rouge (City Park)	Baker
5009	Southeastern Water Resources Assessment	Duncan
5010	Missouri & Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement	Grassley
5010	Missouri & Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement	Bond
5010	Missouri & Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement	Carnahan
5010	Missouri & Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement	McCaskill
5010	Missouri & Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement	Graves
5010	Francis E. Walter Dam	Schwartz
5010	Missouri & Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement	Clay
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Levin
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Dingell
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	McCotter
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Clinton
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Specter
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Kohl
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Voinovich
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Bayh
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Stabenow
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Durbin
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Brown
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Casey
5011	Great Lakes Fishery And Ecosystem Restoration Program	Schumer
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Dingell
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Specter
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	McCotter
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Brown



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Levin
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Kohl
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Voinovich
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Bayh
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Schumer
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Durbin
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Clinton
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Casey
5012	Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans And Sediment Remediation	Stabenow
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Brown
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	McCotter
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Dingell
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Casey
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Durbin
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Clinton
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Stabenow
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Schumer
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Bayh
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Voinovich
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Levin
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Specter
5013	Great Lakes Tributary Models	Kohl
5014(a)	Great Lakes Navigation	Oberstar
5014(b)	Great Lakes Pilot Project	Oberstar
5015	St. Lawrence Seaway	Voinovich
5015	St. Lawrence Seaway	Oberstar
5016	Upper Mississippi River Dispersal Barrier Project	Klobuchar
5016	Upper Mississippi River Dispersal Barrier Project	Oberstar
5016	Upper Mississippi River Dispersal Barrier Project	Coleman
5018	Missouri River And Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, And Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, And Wyoming	Harkin
5018	Missouri River And Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, And Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, And Wyoming	Nelson



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5018	Missouri River And Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, And Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, And Wyoming	Thune
5018	Missouri River And Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, And Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, And Wyoming	Hagel
5018	Missouri River And Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, And Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, And Wyoming	Conrad
5018	Missouri River And Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, And Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, And Wyoming	Baucus
5018	Missouri River And Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, And Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, And Wyoming	Tester
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Specter
5019	Susquehanna, Delaware, And Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Biden
5019	Susquehanna, Delaware, And Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Warner
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Hinchey
5019	Susquehanna, Delaware, And Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Casey
5019	Susquehanna, Delaware, And Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Carper
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Casey
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Carper
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Arcuri
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Gillibrand
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Fallin
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Holden
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Murphy, P.
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Schwartz
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Platts
5019	Susquehanna, Delaware, And Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Specter

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Biden
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Warner
5019	Delaware, Susquehanna, and Potomac River Basins, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia	Dent
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration And Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Webb
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration And Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Specter
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration And Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Cardin
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration And Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Casey
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration And Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Mikulski
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Gilchrest
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Sarbanes
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Hoyer
5020	Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration And Protection Program, Maryland, Pennsylvania, And Virginia	Warner
5021	Chesapeake Bay Oyster Restoration, Virginia and Maryland	Webb
5021	Chesapeake Bay Oyster Restoration, Virginia and Maryland	Mikulski
5021	Chesapeake Bay Oyster Restoration, Virginia and Maryland	Cardin
5021	Chesapeake Bay Oyster Restoration, Virginia and Maryland	Webb
5022	Hypoxia Assessment	Pryce
5023	Potomac River Watershed Assessment and Tributary Strategy and Evaluation and Monitoring Program	Moran
5024	Lock and Dam Security	Duncan
5025	Research and Development Program for Columbia and Snake River Salmon Survival	Baird
5025	Research and Development Program for Columbia and Snake River Salmon Survival	Blumenauer
5027	Rehabilitation	Oberstar
5028	Auburn, Alabama	Rogers, Mike D.
5029	Pinhook Creek, Huntsville, Alabama	Cramer
5030	Alaska	Murkowski
5030	Alaska	Stevens
5030	Alaska	Young, D.
5031	Barrow, Alaska	Young, D.
5032	Lowell Creek Tunnel, Seward, Alaska	Young, D.

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5033	St. Herman and St. Paul Harbors, Alaska	Stevens
5033	St. Herman and St. Paul Harbors, Alaska	Murkowski
5033	St. Herman and St. Paul Harbors, Alaska	Young, D.
5034	Tanana River, Alaska	Young, D.
5035	Wrangell Harbor	Murkowski
5035	Wrangell Harbor	Young, D.
5036	Augusta and Clarendon, Arkansas	Lincoln
5036	Augusta and Clarendon, Arkansas	Berry
5036	Augusta and Clarendon, Arkansas	Pryor
5037	Des Arc Levee Protection	Berry
5037	Des Arc Levee Protection	Lincoln
5037	Des Arc Levee Protection	Pryor
5038	Loomis Landing	Berry
5039	California	Boxer
5040	Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and Tributaries, Stockton, California	Cardoza
5040	Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and Tributaries, Stockton, California	McNerney
5040	Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and Tributaries, Stockton, California	Boxer
5041	Cambria, California	Capps
5042	Contra Costa Canal, Oakley and Knightsen, California; Mallard Slough, Pittsburg, California	Miller, George
5042	Contra Costa Canal, Oakley and Knightsen, California; Mallard Slough, Pittsburg, California	Tauscher
5042	Contra Costa Canal, Oakley and Knightsen, California; Mallard Slough, Pittsburg, California	McNerney
5043	Dana Point Harbor, California	Campbell
5043	East San Joaquin County, California	McNerney
5045	Eastern Santa Clara River Basin, California	McKeon
5046	LA-3 Dredged Material Ocean Disposal Site Designation, California	Boxer
5047	Lancaster, California	McCarthy
5048	Los Osos, California	Capps
5049	Pine Flat Dam Fish & Wildlife Habitat	Nunes
5049	Pine Flat Dam Fish & Wildlife Habitat	Radanovich
5049	Pine Flat Dam Fish & Wildlife Habitat	Boxer
5049	Pine Flat Dam Fish & Wildlife Habitat	Costa
5050	Raymond Basin, Six Basin, Chino Basin, and San Gabriel Basin	Schiff
5050	Raymond Basin, Six Basin, Chino Basin, and San Gabriel Basin	Dreier
5051	San Francisco, California	Pelosi

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5052	San Francisco, California, Waterfront Area	Boxer
5052	San Francisco, California, Waterfront Area	Pelosi
5053	San Pablo Bay, California, Watershed and Suisun Marsh Ecosystem Restoration	Miller, George
5053	San Pablo Bay, California, Watershed and Suisun Marsh Ecosystem Restoration	Tauscher
5053	San Pablo Bay, California, Watershed and Suisun Marsh Ecosystem Restoration	Thompson
5053	San Pablo Bay, California, Watershed and Suisun Marsh Ecosystem Restoration	Boxer
5054	St. Helena, California	Boxer
5054	St. Helena, California	Thompson
5055	Upper Calaveras River, Stockton, California	McNerney
5055	Upper Calaveras River, Stockton, California	Cardoza
5055	Upper Calaveras River, Stockton, California	Boxer
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program	Domenici
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program	Bingaman
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, And Texas	Salazar
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, And Texas	Domenici
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program	Udall, T.
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, And Texas	Hutchison
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program	Pearce
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, And Texas	Bingaman
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program	Wilson, H.
5056	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, And Texas	Cornyn
5057	Charles Hervey Townshend Breakwater, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut	Dodd
5057	Charles Hervey Townshend Breakwater, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut	Lieberman
5057	Charles Hervey Townshend Breakwater, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut	DeLauro
5058	Stamford, Connecticut	Lieberman
5059	Delmarva Conservation Corridor	Gilchrest
5059	Delmarva Conservation Corridor	Castle
5059	Delmarva Conservation Corridor	Carper
5059	Delmarva Conservation Corridor	Biden
5060	Anacostia River, District of Columbia and Maryland	Warner
5060	Anacostia River, District of Columbia and Maryland	Cardin
5060	District of Columbia and Maryland	Norton

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5060	Anacostia River, District of Columbia and Maryland	Mikulski
5061	East Central and Northeast Florida	Mica
5062	Florida Keys Water Quality Improvement	Ros-Lehtinen
5063	Lake Worth, Florida	Klein
5064	Big Creek, Georgia, Watershed Management & Restoration Program	Price
5064	Big Creek, Georgia, Watershed Management & Restoration Program	Isakson
5064	Big Creek, Georgia, Watershed Management & Restoration Program	Chambliss
5065	Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District	Isakson
5065	Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District	Chambliss
5066	Savannah, Georgia	Isakson
5067	Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, And Wyoming	Crapo
5067	Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, And Wyoming	Ensign
5067	Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, And Wyoming	Bennett
5067	Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, And Wyoming	Reid
5067	Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, And Wyoming	Craig
5067	Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, And Wyoming	Thomas
5068	Riley Creek Recreation Area	Simpson
5069	Floodplain Mapping, Little Calumet River	Jackson
5070	Reconstruction of Illinois Flood Protection Projects	Shimkus
5070	Reconstruction of Illinois Flood Protection Projects	Bond
5070	Reconstruction of Illinois Flood Protection Projects	McCaskill
5070	Reconstruction of Illinois Flood Protection Projects	Obama
5070	Reconstruction of Illinois Flood Protection Projects	Durbin
5070	Reconstruction of Illinois Flood Protection Projects	Costello
5071	Illinois River Basin Restoration	Obama
5071	Illinois River Basin Restoration	Durbin
5071	Illinois River Basin Restoration	LaHood
5072	Promontory Point Third-Party Review, Chicago Shoreline, Chicago, Illinois	Obama
5072	Promontory Point Third-Party Review, Chicago Shoreline, Chicago, Illinois	Jackson
5073	Kaskaskia River Basin, Illinois, Restoration	Costello
5073	Kaskaskia River Basin, Illinois, Restoration	Durbin
5073	Kaskaskia River Basin, Illinois, Restoration	Shimkus
5074	Southwest Illinois	Costello

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5075	Calumet Region	Visclosky
5076	Floodplain Mapping, Missouri River	King, S.
5077	Paducah, Kentucky	Whitfield
5078	Southern & Eastern Kentucky	Rogers, H.
5079	Winchester, Kentucky	Chandler
5080	Baton Rouge, Louisiana	Baker
5081	Calcasieu Ship Channel, Louisiana	Boustany
5082	East Atchafalaya Basin and Amite River Basin Region	Baker
5083	Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Project, Louisiana	Vitter
5084	Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana	Vitter
5085	Southeast Louisiana Region, Louisiana	Vitter
5086	West Baton Rouge Parish	Baker
5087	Charlestown, Maryland	Gilchrest
5088	St. Mary's River, Maryland	Hoyer
5088	St. Mary's River, Maryland	Cardin
5089	Massachusetts Dredged Material Disposal Sites	Delahunt
5090	Ontonagon Harbor, Michigan	Stupak
5091	Crookston	Peterson, C.
5092	Garrison and Kathio Township	Klobuchar
5092	Garrison and Kathio Township	Oberstar
5093	Itasca County	Coleman
5093	Itasca County	Oberstar
5094	Minneapolis	Klobuchar
5094	Minneapolis	Ellison
5095	Northeastern Minnesota	Klobuchar
5095	Northeastern Minnesota	Oberstar
5096	Wild Rice River, Minnesota	Peterson, C.
5096	Wild Rice River, Minnesota	Coleman
5096	Wild Rice River, Minnesota	Klobuchar
5097	Mississippi	Cochran
5097	Mississippi	Lott
5098	Harrison, Hancock & Jackson Counties, Mississippi	Taylor
5099	Mississippi River, Missouri and Illinois	Costello
5100	St. Louis, Missouri	Carnahan
5101	St. Louis Regional Greenways, St. Louis, Missouri	Bond
5102	Missoula, Montana	Baucus
5103	St. Mary Project, Glacier County, Montana	Tester
5103	St. Mary Project, Glacier County, Montana	Baucus
5104	Lower Platte River Watershed	Hagel
5104	Lower Platte River Watershed	Fortenberry
5104	Lower Platte River Watershed	Nelson



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5105	Hackensack Meadowlands Area, New Jersey	Rothman
5106	Atlantic Coast of New York	Bishop, T.
5107	College Point, New York City	Crowley
5108	Flushing Bay and Creek	Crowley
5109	Hudson River	Nadler
5110	Mount Morris Dam	Reynolds
5111	North Hempstead and Glen Cove North Shore Watershed Restoration, New York	Clinton
5112	Rochester, New York	Clinton
5113	North Carolina	Burr
5114	Stanly County, North Carolina	Burr
5114	Stanly County, North Carolina	Hayes
5115	John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, North Carolina	Butterfield
5116	Cincinnati, Ohio	Chabot
5116	Cincinnati, Ohio	Schmidt
5117	Ohio River Basin Environmental Management	Lugar
5117	Ohio River Basin Environmental Management	Rahall
5118	Toussaint River Navigation Project, Carroll Township, Ohio	Kaptur
5118	Toussaint River Navigation Project, Carroll Township, Ohio	Voinovich
5119	Statewide Comprehensive Water Planning, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5120	Fern Ridge Dam, Oregon	DeFazio
5121	Allegheny County, Pennsylvania	Doyle
5122	Clinton County, Pennsylvania	Peterson, J
5123	Kehly Run Dams, Pennsylvania	Holden
5124	Lehigh River, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania	Dent
5125	Northeastern Pennsylvania	Carney
5126	Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York	Arcuri
5126	Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York	Hinchey
5126	Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York	Clinton
5126	Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York	Casey
5126	Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York	Specter
5127	Cano Martin Pena, San Juan, Puerto Rico	Menendez
5127	Cano Martin Pena, San Juan, Puerto Rico	Lautenberg
5127	Cano Martin Pena, San Juan, Puerto Rico	Schumer
5127	Cano Martin Pena, San Juan, Puerto Rico	Clinton
5127	Cano Martin Pena, San Juan, Puerto Rico	Fortuno
5128	Lake Marion and Moultrie, South Carolina	Clyburn
5129	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration, South Dakota	Herseth
5129	Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration, South Dakota	Thune
5130	East Tennessee	Duncan

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5131	Fritz Landing, Tennessee	Tanner
5132	J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir, Tennessee	Gordon
5133	Nashville, Tennessee	Alexander
5133	Nashville, Tennessee	Corker
5134	Nonconnah Weir, Memphis, Tennessee	Alexander
5134	Nonconnah Weir, Memphis, Tennessee	Blackburn
5135	Tennessee River Partnership	Duncan
5136	Town Creek, Lenoir City, Tennessee	Duncan
5137	Upper Mississippi Embayment, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi	Berry
5137	Upper Mississippi Embayment, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi	Cohen
5137	Upper Mississippi Embayment, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi	Blackburn
5138	Texas	Hutchison
5138	Texas	Cornyn
5139	Bosque River Watershed, Texas	Edwards
5140	Dallas County Region	Johnson, E.B.
5141	Dallas Floodway	Hutchison
5141	Dallas Floodway	Cornyn
5141	Dallas Floodway	Johnson, E.B.
5141	Dallas Floodway	Sessions
5142	Harris County	Cornyn
5142	Harris County	Hutchison
5142	Harris County	Culberson
5143	Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas	Barton
5143	Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas	Cornyn
5143	Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas	Hutchison
5144	Onion Creek, Texas	Doggett
5144	Onion Creek, Texas	Cornyn
5145	Connecticut River Dams, Vermont	Sanders
5146	Lake Champlain Canal, Vermont and New York	Sanders
5146	Lake Champlain Canal, Vermont and New York	Clinton
5147	Dyke Marsh, Fairfax County, Virginia	Moran
5147	Dyke Marsh, Fairfax County, Virginia	Webb
5148	Eastern Shore and Southwest Virginia	Webb
5148	Eastern Shore and Southwest Virginia	Boucher
5149	James River, Virginia	Warner
5149	James River, Virginia	Webb
5150	Baker Bay and Ilwaco Harbor, Washington	Murray
5150	Baker Bay and Ilwaco Harbor, Washington	Cantwell
5150	Baker Bay and Ilwaco Harbor, Washington	Baird

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5151	Hamilton Island Campground, Washington	Baird
5152	Erosion Control, Puget Island, Wahkiakum County, Washington	Murray
5152	Erosion Control, Puget Island, Wahkiakum County, Washington	Cantwell
5152	Erosion Control, Puget Island, Wahkiakum County, Washington	Wyden
5152	Erosion Control, Puget Island, Wahkiakum County, Washington	Baird
5153	Willapa Bay, Washington	Baird
5154	West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control	Murtha
5154	West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control	Mollohan
5154	West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control	Doyle
5155	Central West Virginia	Capito
5155	Central West Virginia	Capito
5156	Southern West Virginia	Rahall
5157(12)	Perris, California	Issa
5157(13)	Thornton Reservoir, Cook County, Illinois	Jackson
5157(13)	Thornton Reservoir, Cook County, Illinois	Obama
5157(13)	Thornton Reservoir, Cook County, Illinois	Durbin
5157(13)	Thornton Reservoir, Cook County, Illinois	Kirk
5157(13)	Thornton Reservoir, Cook County, Illinois	Rush
5157(14)	Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana	Melancon
5157(15)	Buffalo Bayou, Texas	Hutchison
5157(15)	Buffalo Bayou, Texas	Cornyn
5157(15)	Buffalo Bayou, Texas	Culberson
5157(16)	Halls Bayou, Texas	Cornyn
5157(16)	Halls Bayou, Texas	Hutchison
5157(16)	Halls Bayou, Texas	Green, G.
5157(17)	Menominee River Watershed, Wisconsin	Kohl
5158(001)	Jackson County, Mississippi	Cochran
5158(001)	Jackson County, Mississippi	Lott
5158(072)	Charleston, South Carolina	Brown, H.
5158(078)	St. Clair County	Bachus
5158(079)	Crawford County, Arkansas	Boozman
5158(080)	Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	Tauscher
5158(080)	Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	Miller
5158(081)	Aliso Creek, California	Campbell
5158(082)	Amador County, California	Boxer
5158(083)	Arcadia, Sierra Madre and Upland	Dreier
5158(084)	Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency	Lewis, J.
5158(085)	Brawley Colonia	Filner
5158(086)	Calaveras County, California	Boxer
5158(087)	Contra Costa Water District	Tauscher
5158(087)	Contra Costa Water District	Miller, George

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5158(087)	Contra Costa Water District	McNerney
5158(088)	East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas	Eshoo
5158(088)	East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas	Tauscher
5158(088)	East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas	Miller, George
5158(088)	East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas	Lofgren
5158(088)	East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas	McNerney
5158(088)	East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas	Honda
5158(089)	East Palo Alto, California	Boxer
5158(090)	Imperial County	Filner
5158(091)	La Habra, California	Miller, Gary
5158(092)	La Mirada, California	Boxer
5158(093)	Los Angeles County, California	Miller, Gary
5158(093)	Los Angeles County, California	Waxman
5158(093)	Los Angeles County, California	Boxer
5158(095)	Malibu, California	Boxer
5158(095)	Malibu, California	Waxman
5158(096)	Montebello, California	Boxer
5158(097)	New River, California	Hunter
5158(098)	Orange County, California	Miller, Gary
5158(099)	Port Of Stockton, Stockton, California	Boxer
5158(100)	Perris, California	Boxer
5158(101)	San Bernadino County, California	Miller, Gary
5158(102)	Santa Clara	McNerney
5158(102)	Santa Clara	Lofgren
5158(102)	Santa Clara	Honda
5158(102)	Santa Clara	Eshoo
5158(103)	Santa Monica, California	Boxer
5158(103)	Santa Monica, California	Waxman
5158(104)	Southern Los Angeles County, California	[Millender-McDonald]
5158(105)	Stockton, California	Cardoza
5158(105)	Stockton, California	McNerney
5158(106)	Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, California	Filner
5158(107)	Whittier, California	Miller, Gary
5158(108)	Arkansas Valley Conduit, Colorado	Salazar, J.
5158(108)	Arkansas Valley Conduit, Colorado	Salazar, K.
5158(109)	Boulder County, Colorado	Salazar, K.
5158(110)	Montezuma and La Plata Counties, Colorado	Salazar, J.
5158(111)	Otero, Bent, Crowley, Kiowa, and Prowers Counties, Colorado	Salazar, J.
5158(112)	Pueblo and Otero Counties, Colorado	Musgrave
5158(113)	Enfield, Connecticut	Lieberman

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5158(114)	Ledyard and Montville, Connecticut	Courtney
5158(115)	New Haven, Connecticut	Lieberman
5158(116)	Norwalk, Connecticut	Lieberman
5158(117)	Plainville, Connecticut	Lieberman
5158(118)	Southington, Connecticut	Larson
5158(118)	Southington, Connecticut	Lieberman
5158(119)	Anacostia River	Hoyer
5158(119)	Anacostia River	Norton
5158(120)	Washington, District	Norton
5158(121)	Charlotte County	Mack
5158(122)	Charlotte, Lee & Collier Counties	Buchanan
5158(122)	Charlotte, Lee & Collier Counties	Mack
5158(123)	Collier County	Mack
5158(124)	Hillsborough County, Florida	Castor
5158(124)	Hillsborough County, Florida	Nelson
5158(125)	Jacksonville, Florida	Brown, C.
5158(125)	Jacksonville, Florida	Martinez
5158(126)	Sarasota County, Florida	Nelson
5158(127)	South Seminole and North Orange Counties	Mica
5158(128)	Miami-Dade County, Florida	Nelson
5158(129)	Palm Beach County, Florida	Nelson
5158(129)	Palm Beach County, Florida	Hastings, A.
5158(130)	Albany, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(130)	Albany, Georgia	Isakson
5158(131)	Banks County, Georgia	Isakson
5158(131)	Banks County, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(132)	Berrien County, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(132)	Berrien County, Georgia	Isakson
5158(133)	Chattooga County, Georgia	Isakson
5158(133)	Chattooga County, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(134)	Chattooga, Floyd, Gordon, Walker, And Whitfield Counties, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(134)	Chattooga, Floyd, Gordon, Walker, And Whitfield Counties, Georgia	Isakson
5158(135)	Dahlonega, Georgia	Isakson
5158(135)	Dahlonega, Georgia	Deal
5158(135)	Dahlonega, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(136)	East Point, Georgia	Isakson
5158(136)	East Point, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(137)	Fayetteville, Grantville, LaGrange, Pine Mountain (Harris County), Douglasville and Carrollton	Westmoreland
5158(138)	Meriwether and Spalding Counties, Georgia	Westmoreland

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5158(139)	Moultrie, Georgia	Isakson
5158(139)	Moultrie, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(140)	Stephens County/City Of Toccoa, Georgia	Chambliss
5158(140)	Stephens County/City Of Toccoa, Georgia	Isakson
5158(141)	North Vernon and Butlerville	Hill
5158(142)	Salem, Washington County	Hill
5158(143)	Atchison, Kansas	Roberts
5158(143)	Surfside, South Carolina	Graham
5158(143)	Central Kentucky	Chandler
5158(145)	Lafayette, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(145)	Lafayette, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(146)	Lafourche Parish, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(146)	Lafourche Parish, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(147)	Lake Charles, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(147)	Lake Charles, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(148)	Northwest Louisiana Council Of Governments, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(148)	Northwest Louisiana Council Of Governments, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(149)	Ouachita Parish, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(149)	Ouachita Parish, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(150)	Plaquemine, Louisiana	Baker
5158(151)	Rapides Area Planning Commission, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(151)	Rapides Area Planning Commission, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(152)	Shreveport, Louisiana	McCrery
5158(153)	South Central Planning And Development Commission, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(153)	South Central Planning And Development Commission, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(154)	Union-Lincoln Regional Water Supply Project, Louisiana	Vitter
5158(154)	Union-Lincoln Regional Water Supply Project, Louisiana	Landrieu
5158(155)	Chesapeake Bay Improvements, Maryland, Virginia and District of Columbia	Warner
5158(155)	Chesapeake Bay Improvements, Maryland, Virginia and District of Columbia	Webb
5158(155)	Chesapeake Bay Improvements, Maryland, Virginia and District of Columbia	Cardin
5158(155)	Chesapeake Bay Improvements, Maryland, Virginia and District of Columbia	Mikulski
5158(156)	Chesapeake Bay Region, Maryland And Virginia	Warner
5158(156)	Chesapeake Bay Region, Maryland And Virginia	Mikulski
5158(156)	Chesapeake Bay Region, Maryland And Virginia	Cardin
5158(156)	Chesapeake Bay Region, Maryland And Virginia	Webb
5158(157)	Michigan Combined Sewer Overflows	Levin



Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5158(157)	Michigan Combined Sewer Overflows	Stabenow
5158(158)	Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District, Minnesota	Oberstar
5158(159)	Central Lake Region Sanitary District, Minnesota	Coleman
5158(160)	Goodview, Minnesota	Coleman
5158(161)	Grand Rapids, Minnesota	Coleman
5158(161)	Grand Rapids, Minnesota	Oberstar
5158(162)	Willmar, Minnesota	Coleman
5158(163)	Biloxi, Mississippi	Taylor
5158(164)	Corinth, Mississippi	Cochran
5158(164)	Corinth, Mississippi	Lott
5158(165)	Gulfport, Mississippi	Taylor
5158(166)	Harrison County, Mississippi	Taylor
5158(167)	Jackson County, Mississippi	Lott
5158(168)	Clark County, Nevada	Porter
5158(168)	Clark County, Nevada	Reid
5158(169)	Clean Water Coalition, Nevada	Ensign
5158(169)	Clean Water Coalition, Nevada	Reid
5158(170)	Glendale Dam Diversion Structure, Nevada	Reid
5158(170)	Glendale Dam Diversion Structure, Nevada	Ensign
5158(171)	Henderson	Porter
5158(172)	Indian Springs, Nevada	Reid
5158(173)	Reno, Nevada	Reid
5158(173)	Reno, Nevada	Ensign
5158(174)	Washoe County, Nevada	Reid
5158(174)	Washoe County, Nevada	Ensign
5158(175)	Cranford Township, New Jersey	Lautenburg
5158(175)	Cranford Township, New Jersey	Menendez
5158(176)	Middletown Township, New Jersey	Lautenburg
5158(176)	Middletown Township, New Jersey	Menendez
5158(177)	Paterson, New Jersey	Pascrell
5158(178)	Rahway Valley, New Jersey	Menendez
5158(178)	Rahway Valley, New Jersey	Lautenburg
5158(179)	Babylon, New York	Schumer
5158(179)	Babylon, New York	Clinton
5158(180)	Ellicottville, New York	Kuhl
5158(181)	Elmira, New York	Clinton
5158(181)	Elmira, New York	Schumer
5158(182)	Essex Hamlet, New York	McHugh
5158(182)	Essex Hamlet, New York	Schumer
5158(182)	Essex Hamlet, New York	Clinton
5158(183)	Fleming, New York	Schumer

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5158(183)	Fleming, New York	Clinton
5158(184)	Kiryas Joel, New York	Schumer
5158(184)	Kiryas Joel, New York	Clinton
5158(185)	Niagara Falls, New York	Clinton
5158(185)	Niagara Falls, New York	Schumer
5158(186)	Patchogue, New York	Schumer
5158(186)	Patchogue, New York	Clinton
5158(187)	Sennett, New York	Arcuri
5158(188)	Springport and Fleming, New York	Arcuri
5158(189)	Wellsville, New York	Kuhl
5158(190)	Yates County, New York	Clinton
5158(190)	Yates County, New York	Schumer
5158(191)	Cabarrus County, North Carolina	Hayes
5158(192)	Cary, Wake County, North Carolina	Dole
5158(192)	Cary, Wake County, North Carolina	Burr
5158(193)	Charlotte, North Carolina	Hayes
5158(193)	Charlotte, North Carolina	Dole
5158(194)	Fayetteville, North Carolina	Hayes
5158(194)	Fayetteville, North Carolina	Dole
5158(195)	Mooreville, North Carolina	McHenry
5158(195)	Mooreville, North Carolina	Dole
5158(196)	Neuse Regional Water And Sewer Authority, North Carolina	Dole
5158(196)	Neuse Regional Water And Sewer Authority, North Carolina	Burr
5158(197)	Richmond County, North Carolina	Hayes
5158(198)	Union County, North Carolina	Hayes
5158(199)	Washington County, North Carolina	Dole
5158(199)	Washington County, North Carolina	Burr
5158(200)	Winston-Salem, North Carolina	Watt
5158(200)	Winston-Salem, North Carolina	Dole
5158(201)	North Dakota	Conrad
5158(202)	Devil's Lake, North Dakota	Pomeroy
5158(202)	Devils Lake, North Dakota	Conrad
5158(203)	Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands	Young
5158(204)	Akron, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(205)	Burr Oak Regional Water District, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(206)	Cincinnati, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(207)	Cleveland, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(208)	Columbus, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(209)	Dayton, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(210)	Defiance County, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(211)	Fostoria, Ohio	Voinovich

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5158(212)	Fremont, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(213)	Lake County, Ohio	LaTourette
5158(214)	Lawrence County, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(215)	Meigs County, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(216)	Mentor-on-Lake, Ohio	LaTourette
5158(217)	Vinton County, Ohio	Voinovich
5158(218)	Willowick, Ohio	LaTourette
5158(219)	Ada, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(220)	Alva, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(221)	Ardmore, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(222)	Bartlesville, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(223)	Bethany, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(224)	Chickasha, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(225)	Disney And Langley, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(226)	Durant, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(227)	Eastern Oklahoma State University, Wilberton, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(228)	Guymon, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(229)	Konawa, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(230)	Lugert-Altus Irrigation District, Altus, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(231)	Midwest City, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(232)	Mustang, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(233)	Norman, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(234)	Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Guymon, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(235)	Weatherford, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(236)	Woodward, Oklahoma	Inhofe
5158(237)	Albany, Oregon	Defazio
5158(238)	Beaver Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania	Specter
5158(238)	Beaver Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania	Casey
5158(239)	Hatfield Borough, Pennsylvania	Schwartz
5158(240)	Lehigh County, Pennsylvania	Dent
5158(241)	North Wales Borough, Pennsylvania	Schwartz
5158(242)	Pen Argyl, Pennsylvania	Dent
5158(243)	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Schwartz
5158(244)	Stockerton Borough, Borough of Tatamy, and Palmer Township	Dent
5158(245)	Vera Cruz, Pennsylvania	Dent
5158(246)	Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	Fortuno
5158(247)	Charleston, South Carolina	Brown, H.
5158(247)	Charleston, South Carolina	Graham
5158(247)	Charleston, South Carolina	Clyburn
5158(248)	Charleston and West Ashley, South Carolina	Graham
5158(249)	Crooked Creek, Bennettsville, South Carolina	Spratt

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
5158(250)	Myrtle Beach, South Carolina	Graham
5158(250)	Myrtle Beach, South Carolina	Brown, H.
5158(251)	North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina	Graham
5158(251)	North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina	Brown, H.
5158(252)	Surfside, South Carolina	Brown, H.
5158(253)	Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation (Dewey And Ziebach Counties) And Perkins And Meade Counties, South Dakota	Johnson
5158(253)	Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation (Dewey And Ziebach Counties) And Perkins And Meade Counties, South Dakota	Thune
5158(254)	Athens, Tennessee	Duncan
5158(255)	Blaine, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(256)	Clairborne County, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(257)	Giles, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(257)	Giles, Tennessee	Davis, L.
5158(258)	Grainger County, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(259)	Hamilton County, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(260)	Harrogate, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(261)	Johnson County, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(262)	Knoxville, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(263)	Nashville, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(264)	Lewis, Lawrence And Wayne, Tennessee	Davis, L.
5158(264)	Lewis, Lawrence And Wayne Counties, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(265)	Oak Ridge, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(265)	Oak Ridge, Tennessee	Corker
5158(266)	Plateau Utility District, Morgan County, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(267)	Shelby County, Tennessee	Alexander
5158(268)	Central Texas	Edwards
5158(269)	El Paso County, Texas	Reyes
5158(270)	Fort Bend County	Lampson
5158(271)	Duchesne, Iron, and Uintah Counties, Utah	Matheson
5158(272)	Northern West Virginia	Mollohan
5158(273)	United States Virgin Islands	Christensen
6001	Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida	Martinez
6001	Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida	Nelson
6001	Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida	Hastings, A.
6001	Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida	Klein
6001	Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida	Diaz-Balart, M.
6001	Hillsboro and Okeechobee Aquifer, Florida	Mahoney
6002	Pilot Projects	Diaz-Balart, M.
6003	Maximum Costs	Hastings, A.
6003	Maximum Costs	Martinez
6003	Maximum Costs	Nelson

Water Resources Development Act of 2007		
Conference Section	Project Name	Member
6004	Credit	Mahoney
6004	Credit	Hastings, A.
6004	Credit	Diaz-Balart, M.
6006	Critical Restoration Projects	Martinez
6006	Critical Restoration Projects	Hastings, A.
6006	Critical Restoration Projects	Mahoney
6006	Critical Restoration Projects	Diaz-Balart, M.
6006	Critical Restoration Projects	Nelson
6007	Regional Engineering Model For Environmental Restoration	Oberstar
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Melancon
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Jindal
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Boustany
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Baker
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Durbin
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Obama
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Vitter
Title VII	Louisiana Coastal Area	Landrieu
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Graves
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Costello
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Harkin
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Bond
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Durbin
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	LaHood
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Hulshof
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Klobuchar
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Obama
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	McCaskill
Title VIII	Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway	Grassley

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JAMES L. OBERSTAR,  
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,  
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER,  
BRIAN BAIRD,  
BRIAN HIGGINS,  
HARRY E. MITCHELL,  
STEVE KAGEN,  
JERRY MCNERNEY,  
JOHN L. MICA,  
JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr.,  
VERNON J. EHLERS,  
R.H. BAKER,  
HENRY E. BROWN, Jr.,  
JOHN BOOZMAN,

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 2014, 2023, and 6009 of the House bill, and secs. 3023, 5008, and 5016 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

NICK RAHALL,  
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,  
CATHY MCMORRIS  
RODGERS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

BARBARA BOXER,  
MAX BAUCUS,  
JOE LIEBERMAN,  
TOM CARPER,  
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON,  
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,  
JAMES M. INHOFE,  
JOHN WARNER,  
GEORGE V. VOINOVICH,  
JOHNNY ISAKSON,  
DAVID VITTER,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### DEMOCRATIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS OVER THE FIRST SEVEN MONTHS OF THIS CONGRES- SIONAL SESSION

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, over the last 7 months, the new Democratic Congress has amassed an impressive record of accomplishment, making real progress on issues important to the American people.

Last week, thanks to our efforts, the minimum wage was increased for the first time in a decade. We also sent to the President's desk one of the most important bills of the new Congress, legislation that will make America safer by finally enacting the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

Last week, the House also passed a farm bill that reforms our Nation's farm policy by committing more resources to nutrition and conservation programs, while also addressing the needs of our Nation's family farmers.

And our efforts continue this week. Today, we will live up to our promise to change the way business is done here in Washington when we pass the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act. Tomorrow, we will strengthen the health care safety net programs essential to our children and seniors. And then on Thursday we will pass a comprehensive energy bill that reduces our dependence on foreign oil and fights global warming.

Democrats are delivering results and doing it in a new way.

□ 1015

#### THE LIGHT BULB ENERGY POLICY

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, oh, how we talk and pontificate about making the United States independent from foreign energy. But still little has been done. The new energy bill does not promote energy, but punishes energy use. For example, new energy legislation regulates the type of light bulbs Americans use.

Some in the House want to go after the U.S. oil companies and punish them by taxing them more. Of course, more taxes will simply be passed on to us, the consumers, and will not increase energy, but decrease it.

You see, when you tax something, you get less of it. More taxes will encourage U.S. oil companies and refiners just to move someplace else where there are fewer taxes and regulations. Some want to mandate and subsidize corn-based ethanol, which not only drives gasoline prices up, but raises the price of food at the same time.

A real energy bill would allow safe drilling for oil and natural gas off our shores and in ANWR. A real energy bill would advance nuclear power. A real energy bill would work with all types of U.S. energy companies and not make them out to be the enemies.

A real energy bill would do more than require us to use certain light bulbs that, by the way, are only made in China.

And that's just the way it is.

#### A STRATEGY DESERVING OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S SUPPORT

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our intelligence agencies have confirmed that America is more vulnerable now than it was 6 years ago before the 9/11 attacks. That is because Osama bin Laden has gained strength, gained recruits and gained experience in the meantime.

It didn't have to be that way. We had him cornered and crippled in Tora Bora, but then we outsourced the job of capturing him. Then, to make matters worse, we poured our military and financial resources into Iraq, where al Qaeda was nonexistent, thereby giving Osama bin Laden his most effective recruiting tool.

The President keeps referring to al Qaeda in Iraq. It is not the Iraqis who are planning on how to attack America. It is al Qaeda in Waziristan. We need an intelligence strategy to go after bin Laden in Waziristan with our Special Operations working with the tribal chiefs who want to rid themselves of this pest. That is what we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only strategy that is deserving of the sacrifice of our military families. We need leadership that is deserving of the American public's support.

#### THE BROADCASTER FREEDOM ACT

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the so-called Fairness Doctrine was rescinded by the FCC nearly 20 years ago, some of the most powerful voices in Congress are calling for a return of this outright censorship of the broadcast airwaves of America. In response, we introduced the Broadcaster Freedom Act, legislation that would ensure that no future President could return to the Fairness Doctrine without an act of Congress.

I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that more than 140 Members of Congress have cosponsored this legislation to date. Last week, the current chairman of the FCC wrote to say that there was "no compelling reason to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine." Its predecessor from 20 years hence said that reimposing the Fairness Doctrine would be a "colossal mistake."

Mr. Speaker, let's say yes to the freedom of the press. Let's say yes to the freedom of the American people to choose when and how and where they get their information on government. I urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to join me in cosponsoring the Broadcaster Freedom Act this week.

#### HOUSE DEMOCRATS ARE STRENGTHENING THE CHIP AND CHAMP PROGRAM

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will vote on the CHAMP Act, a bill that reauthorizes our Children's Health Insurance Program. This program will provide millions of children new health coverage and, through this program, protects Medicare for America's seniors.

Passing the CHAMP Act will reauthorize the vital CHIP program, which is set to expire September 30 of this year. Currently 6 million vulnerable American children receive health care benefits through the CHIP. If CHIP did not exist, these millions of children would not have access to quality health care. The CHAMP Act also provides protection for our seniors. It ensures that they continue to have access to the doctors of their choice by stopping a 10 percent payment cut to the doctors and encourages them to seek preventative health care benefits by eliminating copayments and deductibles.



Mr. Speaker, in one bill, this House is addressing the health care needs of our children and our seniors.

#### DON'T OUTSOURCE AMERICAN JOBS TO IMPORT LESS OIL

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let's talk just for a moment about what the impact would be if the Democrats' plan to arbitrarily impose draconian fuel standards on our domestic automobile industry were to be enacted. First of all, our cars would get smaller, less safe, more expensive and more likely to be built in foreign countries.

Because American automobile companies lose money on every American-built small car, these vehicles would have to be built in low-wage foreign countries like Mexico, China, Korea or Japan. More American automobile workers will lose their jobs. In order to meet the new Federal regulations, experts suggest prices will be going up by more than \$6,000 per vehicle.

The Democrats' CAFE proposal is nothing more than a stealth tax on American families and businesses. It will put smaller, less safe cars on our roadways, increasing traffic injuries and deaths, and the efforts to reduce our dependence on foreign oil will be outsourced to cheap foreign labor. Does that sound like a good plan to you?

#### DEMOCRATS DELIVER ON PROMISE TO CHANGE THE WAY BUSINESS IS DONE IN WASHINGTON

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, when Democrats took control of Congress in January, we vowed to make some changes around here. The American people were rightfully disgusted by several examples of unethical behavior that made this entire institution look bad. The Senate and House have now reconciled differences between two different lobbying reform bills passed earlier this year. Today, the House will give final approval to the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act.

The bill requires greater transparency of lobbyists so they are more accountable to the American people. Specifically, the bill requires lobbyists to file their lobbying activities in an electronic database that is accessible to the public. It also ends the K Street Project by prohibiting Members of Congress and their staff from attempting to influence employment decisions in exchange for political access.

Mr. Speaker, congressional Democrats said we were going to change the way business is done here, and today we will deliver on that promise by

passing the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act.

#### FREE TRADE CREATES PROSPERITY FOR ALL

(Mr. CALVERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALVERT. Since 2000, foreign trade has increased by more than 20 percent. During that same time, more than 7 million new jobs have been created. Simply put, free trade works.

I strongly urge Congress to move forward with passing the recently negotiated trade agreements with South Korea and Colombia. These agreements will bring down barriers in two of the fastest growing markets in Asia and South America. American business sectors such as automobiles, agriculture, textiles and services will be allowed unprecedented access. In addition, favorable trade environments will be created for intellectual property, telecommunications and workers.

As Congress continues to examine its trade policy, we should not forget to take a close look at what we can do here at home to maximize the benefits of free trade while minimizing its impacts.

Mr. Speaker, since 2000, southern California has seen a 40 percent increase in container traffic on road and rails. This is causing serious transportation problems for both businesses and constituents in my district. The Nation must address this concern so that businesses can receive their goods efficiently and Americans are not overwhelmed by increased freight traffic. Fortunately, free trade affords us the resources we need to address its infrastructure impacts so that the prosperity it creates is shared by all.

#### PROVIDING COST-EFFECTIVE HEALTH INSURANCE FOR UNINSURED CHILDREN

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last week, House Democrats unveiled the Children's Health and Medicare Protection Act, a bill that reauthorizes CHIP, ensures millions of children receive the health benefits they need, and protects Medicare for American seniors. The bill comes a week after the National Governors' Association, made up of both Democrats and Republicans, called for urgent action to reauthorize the CHIP program.

Unfortunately, while strengthening CHIP has broad bipartisan support from our Nation's Governors and the U.S. Senate, the Bush administration and congressional Republicans oppose efforts to strengthen the program so it does not continually run out of money.

As a professional social worker, I recognize the threat to America's children, and I must protest. Instead, they

are proposing to underfund the program significantly, which would cause millions of children to lose coverage, including children in my own State of New Hampshire and States across the country.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring America's children have affordable health care costs less than \$3.50 a day to cover a child. House Democrats are committed to passing this cost-effective health coverage for millions of uninsured children.

#### CONGRATULATING KATIE KNOPF ON HER MAYOR FOR A DAY ESSAY

(Mr. ROSKAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an outstanding program in my congressional district, the Sixth District of Illinois. It is the Mayor for a Day Essay Contest hosted and sponsored by the Character Counts in Elmhurst Coalition in Elmhurst, Illinois.

This year's winner, a winner from among 1,000 entries of first through eighth graders, is Katie Knopf. When asked the question, what should a person living in Elmhurst do and what should their responsibility be, she said to work as much as she possibly can on her schoolwork, to do volunteer work to contribute to the community. "It is my responsibility," she said, "to set a good example for the younger children in my neighborhood. All in all, I need to be a good and caring person."

Indeed, Katie. Well done. Good advice for us all.

#### HOUSE DEMOCRATS ADDRESS HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, the Children's Health Insurance Program, better known as CHIP, was created as a partnership between the States and the Federal Government to ensure that more children would have access to health insurance. Over the last decade, it has been received as a strong, bipartisan effort.

The success of the program is not questioned. Thanks to CHIP, the number of uninsured children has decreased every year for the last decade, except for this past year when the number of children actually increased.

This week, the House will vote on the CHAMP Act, a bill that strengthens the Children's Health Program so that it reaches nearly all of the children that are eligible for the program. Currently, CHIP reaches 6 million, but there are 6 million kids that aren't insured yet.

Today, there is simply not enough funding to enroll more children. But that is going to change this week,

when the House adds on an additional \$50 billion over the next 5 years to the CHIP program. That will ensure that an additional 5 million children are insured.

Let's once again act in a bipartisan fashion this week and pass the CHAMP Act.

#### GOOD NEWS COMING OUT OF IRAQ

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about some of the good news coming out of Iraq. I realize the Democratic majority would like to spend most of our time talking about failure in Iraq. Indeed, that is what we have done during the first 7 months of Congress. However, the new strategy in Iraq and the new general in charge are making real progress on the ground.

The Iraqi people are beginning to stand up for the safety and security of their neighborhoods. A recent story in the *Times of London* states the increased presence of U.S. forces in the Doura neighborhood in South Baghdad, "is encouraging insiders to overcome their fear and divulge what they know. Convoys of U.S. soldiers are working the rubble-strewn streets day and night, knocking on doors, speaking to locals and following up on leads on possible insurgent hideouts."

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the members of the Armed Forces who have given their lives, we owe it to the Iraqi people, to give this new strategy a chance to succeed, and we need to talk about their successes.

□ 1030

#### CONGRESS MUST ACT ON IRAQ

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are demanding that this Congress take action to responsibly end the war in Iraq and bring our troops home safely. If the results of last November's election were not clear enough, a poll released last week indicates that a majority of Americans look to Congress and not the President to extricate ourselves from this dangerous mess. Day after day we hear about Republicans "questioning" the President's stay-the-course strategy.

But mere words that grab headlines will not guarantee the responsible disengagement of our troops. Congressional action can and will.

Earlier this month, the House passed the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act, a plan that would bring our troops home by April of next year. Sadly, the measure received just four Republican votes. Rather than join our efforts, most Republicans continue to block meaningful attempts to end this war.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to raise questions, but actions speak louder than words. This week Republicans get another chance. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to listen to the American people; take action now and bring our troops home.

#### CLOSE FISA LOOPHOLE

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, our Nation faces an increased threat of a terrorist attack, and yet, Members on both sides of the aisle are well aware of a problem with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. There is a giant loophole that handcuffs the ability of our Nation and our intelligence services to gather the information that would better protect the American people and our allies around the world.

Congress has known about this issue over the last 3 or 4 months, and yet the majority has refused to bring that issue to this floor.

I encourage all of my colleagues to insist that before we leave here for the August district work period, that Congress deal with FISA modernization and close this terrorist loophole so we can better protect the American people.

#### PASS TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH PERU, PANAMA AND COLOMBIA

(Mr. WELLER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, trade is important to my home State of Illinois. One in five manufacturing jobs depends on trade; 40 percent of agricultural products are exported from Illinois; and I would note, of the 17,000 Illinois companies that are dependent on trade, the vast majority are small employers.

We have a great opportunity with some new trade agreements with Peru, Panama, and Colombia. They are important both for Illinois jobs as well as for democratic security in our hemisphere. I would note today for our friends in Panama, Peru and Colombia, their products come to the United States tax free. But when we sell our products to them, we pay taxes. Our partners have agreed to eliminate those taxes and level the playing field. It is time to honor our commitments with our trading partners. Unfortunately, some in the Democratic leadership have said they would reject a deal with our best friend in Latin America, Colombia, and have told our other trading partners they just are not worthy of a trade agreement. No wonder so many in Latin America think the United States Congress is turning its back on Latin America. Peru, Panama and Colombia represent our best allies.

They are good trade agreements. Let's move forward and level the playing field. Pass these trade agreements.

#### IRAN SANCTIONS ENABLING ACT

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, Iran's self-proclaimed ambition to develop nuclear weapons is a grave threat to the United States and the world. Imagine the consequences of Iran developing nuclear weapons. It would destabilize the Middle East in an unprecedented fashion, ramp up the threat to our greatest ally, Israel, and give Islamic extremists the means to satisfy their gruesome goal, which is to bring chaos and death to our Nation and world.

In confronting this perilous threat, the United States must employ every element of our national power to stop the Iranian nuclear weapons program. The House will take a strong step today in that direction by passing the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, which discourages investment in Iran's energy sector.

Countering the Iranian threat requires a steady, rational assessment of the world around us. And when a country led by Islamic extremists vows to attack our greatest ally and our country, you better believe we will stand firm and stare down the enemy.

#### PRO-TRADE AGENDA

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, we must continue to open markets to encourage American companies to innovate and compete with our global counterparts. This grows our economy and creates jobs.

I am proud to represent a district in Washington State that integrates our Nation's leading technology innovators with a vibrant and highly productive small business community. Opening new global markets gives them the incentives to improve their products, produce more goods, and employ more American workers.

I have seen these jobs created in Washington State firsthand, with trade accounting for one of every three jobs in the State of Washington. Free trade agreements with Peru, Colombia, Panama and South Korea are currently pending before Congress. We cannot allow these important agreements to languish in committee.

I urge my colleagues in the majority to stop the delays, pass these free trade agreements and renew trade promotion authority. Let's advance the trade measures needed to grow our economy, create jobs and improve our relations with global partners.

### PASS U.S.-KOREA TRADE AGREEMENT

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if we want good jobs for our families, it is no longer enough to buy American; we have to sell American, sell our products and services throughout the world. The good news is that, since January, what we are selling overseas is growing faster than what America is buying from overseas.

The way to sustain that positive trend is to keep finding new customers like Peru and Panama, Colombia and South Korea. If we are serious about creating better jobs, Congress should pass the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement this year. Korea is one of the top ten economies in the world. They are our seventh largest customer, and an even bigger customer for America's agricultural community.

This agreement will give us access to nearly 50 million new customers and open the door to competing better in the entire Asian market, including against China. This agreement will lower border taxes and barriers to America's manufacturers, technology, insurance and financial services companies, our farmers and ranchers.

This fall, Congress needs to spend less time settling old political scores and more time opening up markets for good old American products in Korea.

### WAIT FOR PETRAEUS REPORT

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, we are all anticipating the report David Petraeus will bring us in mid-September. But between now and then, there is hard work, dangerous work, and important work that has to be done.

For Members on the other side of the aisle to begin to anticipate what David may say to us and to plan political spinning of that is irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, that is the "ready, fire, aim" approach to taking a position. That works well in a target-rich environment like the Alamo or Little Bighorn, but it is unworthy of Members of this body.

Let's don't anticipate what David might say. Let's don't undermine that work that is going on in Iraq. Let's take the responsible position and listen to what he has to say before we try to spin it.

### ELIMINATE TRADE BARRIERS

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental freedom of the Amer-

ican people to purchase products in an open, competitive market. International trade is the key to opening more markets for more American consumers. More trade means more competition, and competition means families can buy more using less of their paychecks. More trade also means expanded opportunities for American exporters and job creation.

Many Democrats claim that trade, for some reason, is a bad thing for our economy. They are wrong. The facts show that trade has had a very good impact on our economy. Approximately 12 million, or 10 percent, of all U.S. jobs depend on exports. One in five factory jobs depend on international Federal trade.

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has emphasized that because of increased trade since World War II, U.S. annual incomes have been boosted over \$10,000 per household. And if we would just eliminate all remaining trade barriers, U.S. incomes would rise anywhere from \$4,000 to \$12,000.

We in Congress may have the power, but do we have the right to deny Americans better incomes and better opportunities by preventing them from buying cheaper products overseas? I say "no."

### PASS PENDING TRADE AGREEMENTS

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass several pending trade agreements. I believe in the benefits of free and fair trade. I support efforts to open foreign markets to American goods and services whenever possible because such efforts lead to increased economic growth for the Nation as a whole.

With approximately one in every four jobs in my congressional district being tied to trade, the expansion of trade means a healthy future for a number of local businesses, and in turn, new jobs for my district and the Nation.

It is disappointing that the Democratic majority has not embraced these trade agreements, as they would mean new jobs for citizens across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I remain committed to the benefits of free and fair trade, and I urge this House to take action on these agreements.

### PROMOTING HEALTH CARE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

(Mr. BOUSTANY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, according to Medicare trustees, that program requires an immediate 51 percent cut, a payroll tax increase of 122 percent, or a blend of both to keep the program running during the next 75 years.

Worse yet, the trustees assume that a separate 41 percent cut in payments for Medicare physician services will happen during the next 9 years. The American Academy of Actuaries reports, without congressional action, Medicare and Social Security will consume up to 80 percent of the Federal budget by 2040.

How, then, does a key member of Ways and Means Committee contend that Medicare is already "solvent and sustainable"?

Washington needs to pull its head out of the sand. Ignoring Medicare's financial problems will only make the solutions more painful for generations of taxpayers and retirees.

And now, the Democrats want to expand SCHIP with questionable means to pay for it. Short of comprehensive reform, Congress should at least make it easier for our shrinking workforce to save for future health care needs, including the rising cost of Medicare premiums.

I urge my colleagues to support the Promoting Health for Future Generations Act of 2007, H.R. 2639. Doing so will help the middle class to build a nest egg, while protecting access to affordable health care.

### FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for enacting the free trade agreements with our allies, democracies in Latin America like Colombia, Peru and Panama.

I am disappointed, frankly, that the Democratic leadership has broken the agreement they made with the administration in May to bring these vital trade agreements to the floor. We have not seen them yet.

Enactment of these important agreements will strengthen the economies of our democratic allies in the region, as well as our own.

I am a strong supporter of free trade with these free nations, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to enact free trade agreements this year and to hold the Democratic leadership's feet to the fire to make sure that they do not break their agreement that they entered into in May.

### KILL CONGRESSIONAL PENSIONS FOR FELONS

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, Congress should kill the pension for Members of Congress convicted of a felony. In January, I offered legislation, H.R. 14, that killed a pension on the conviction of any one of 21 public integrity felonies. Both Speaker PELOSI and Hastert voted for this reform.

But the bill we consider today leaves congressional pensions intact for violating 17 of these felonies, including income tax evasion, wire fraud, intimidation to secure contributions, and making fraudulent claims.

In January, we passed a limited reform bill that killed a pension for conviction of only four felonies. But shockingly, this bill has now been gutted.

In January we voted to kill the pension for a Member of Congress convicted of acting as a foreign agent, but this felony has now been deleted from the final package. Who deleted it? Is it okay for a Member of Congress convicted of a felony by acting as a foreign agent?

As you can see, the bill we will consider today falls far short of its potential for reform. A Member convicted of acting as a foreign agent should not receive a taxpayer pension.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

#### HONEST LEADERSHIP AND OPEN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1) to provide greater transparency in the legislative process, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

##### S. 1

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

##### TITLE I—CLOSING THE REVOLVING DOOR

Sec. 101. Amendments to restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches.

Sec. 102. Wrongfully influencing a private entity’s employment decisions or practices.

Sec. 103. Notification of post-employment restrictions.

Sec. 104. Exception to restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branch.

Sec. 105. Effective date.

##### TITLE II—FULL PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING

Sec. 201. Quarterly filing of lobbying disclosure reports.

Sec. 202. Additional disclosure.

Sec. 203. Semiannual reports on certain contributions.

Sec. 204. Disclosure of bundled contributions.

Sec. 205. Electronic filing of lobbying disclosure reports.

Sec. 206. Prohibition on provision of gifts or travel by registered lobbyists to Members of Congress and to congressional employees.

Sec. 207. Disclosure of lobbying activities by certain coalitions and associations.

Sec. 208. Disclosure by registered lobbyists of past executive branch and congressional employment.

Sec. 209. Public availability of lobbying disclosure information; maintenance of information.

Sec. 210. Disclosure of enforcement for non-compliance.

Sec. 211. Increased civil and criminal penalties for failure to comply with lobbying disclosure requirements.

Sec. 212. Electronic filing and public database for lobbyists for foreign governments.

Sec. 213. Comptroller General audit and annual report.

Sec. 214. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 215. Effective date.

##### TITLE III—MATTERS RELATING TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 301. Disclosure by Members and staff of employment negotiations.

Sec. 302. Prohibition on lobbying contacts with spouse of Member who is a registered lobbyist.

Sec. 303. Treatment of firms and other businesses whose members serve as House committee consultants.

Sec. 304. Posting of travel and financial disclosure reports on public website of Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 305. Prohibiting participation in lobbyist-sponsored events during political conventions.

Sec. 306. Exercise of rulemaking Authority.

##### TITLE IV—CONGRESSIONAL PENSION ACCOUNTABILITY

Sec. 401. Loss of pensions accrued during service as a Member of Congress for abusing the public trust.

##### TITLE V—SENATE LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

###### Subtitle A—Procedural Reform

Sec. 511. Amendments to rule XXVIII.

Sec. 512. Notice of objecting to proceeding.

Sec. 513. Public availability of Senate committee and subcommittee meetings.

Sec. 514. Amendments and motions to recommit.

Sec. 515. Sense of the Senate on conference committee protocols.

###### Subtitle B—Earmark Reform

Sec. 521. Congressionally directed spending.

###### Subtitle C—Revolving Door Reform

Sec. 531. Post-employment restrictions.

Sec. 532. Disclosure by Members of Congress and staff of employment negotiations.

Sec. 533. Elimination of floor privileges for former Members, Senate officers, and Speakers of the House who are registered lobbyists or seek financial gain.

Sec. 534. Influencing hiring decisions.  
Sec. 535. Notification of post-employment restrictions.

###### Subtitle D—Gift and Travel Reform

Sec. 541. Ban on gifts from registered lobbyists and entities that hire registered lobbyists.

Sec. 542. National party conventions.

Sec. 543. Proper valuation of tickets to entertainment and sporting events.

Sec. 544. Restrictions on registered lobbyist participation in travel and disclosure.

Sec. 545. Free attendance at a constituent event.

Sec. 546. Senate privately paid travel public website.

###### Subtitle E—Other Reforms

Sec. 551. Compliance with lobbying disclosure.

Sec. 552. Prohibit official contact with spouse or immediate family member of Member who is a registered lobbyist.

Sec. 553. Mandatory Senate ethics training for Members and staff.

Sec. 554. Annual report by Select Committee on Ethics.

Sec. 555. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

Sec. 555. Effective date and general provisions.

##### TITLE VI—PROHIBITED USE OF PRIVATE AIRCRAFT

Sec. 601. Restrictions on Use of Campaign Funds for Flights on Non-commercial Aircraft.

##### TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 701. Sense of the Congress that any applicable restrictions on congressional officials and employees should apply to the executive and judicial branches.

Sec. 702. Knowing and willful falsification or failure to report.

Sec. 703. Rule of construction.

##### TITLE I—CLOSING THE REVOLVING DOOR

#### SEC. 101. AMENDMENTS TO RESTRICTIONS ON FORMER OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AND ELECTED OFFICIALS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES.

(a) VERY SENIOR EXECUTIVE PERSONNEL.—The matter after subparagraph (C) in section 207(d)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “within 1 year” and inserting “within 2 years”.

(b) RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND EMPLOYEES OF CONGRESS.—Subsection (e) of section 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (9);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(3) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND ELECTED OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE.—

“(A) SENATORS.—Any person who is a Senator and who, within 2 years after that person leaves office, knowingly makes, with the intent to influence, any communication to or appearance before any Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress or any employee of any other legislative office of the Congress, on behalf of any other person (except the United States) in connection with any matter on which such former Senator seeks action by a Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress, in his or her official capacity, shall be punished as provided in section 216 of this title.

“(B) MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(i) Any person who is

a Member of the House of Representatives or an elected officer of the House of Representatives and who, within 1 year after that person leaves office, knowingly makes, with the intent to influence, any communication to or appearance before any of the persons described in clause (ii) or (iii), on behalf of any other person (except the United States) in connection with any matter on which such former Member of Congress or elected officer seeks action by a Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress, in his or her official capacity, shall be punished as provided in section 216 of this title.

“(ii) The persons referred to in clause (i) with respect to appearances or communications by a former Member of the House of Representatives are any Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress and any employee of any other legislative office of the Congress.

“(iii) The persons referred to in clause (i) with respect to appearances or communications by a former elected officer are any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

“(2) OFFICERS AND STAFF OF THE SENATE.—Any person who is an elected officer of the Senate, or an employee of the Senate to whom paragraph (7)(A) applies, and who, within 1 year after that person leaves office or employment, knowingly makes, with the intent to influence, any communication to or appearance before any Senator or any officer or employee of the Senate, on behalf of any other person (except the United States) in connection with any matter on which such former elected officer or former employee seeks action by a Senator or an officer or employee of the Senate, in his or her official capacity, shall be punished as provided in section 216 of this title.”

(4) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “of a Senator or an employee of a Member of the House of Representatives” and inserting “of a Member of the House of Representatives to whom paragraph (7)(A) applies”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “Senator or”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “Senator or”;

(5) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “committee of Congress” and inserting “committee of the House of Representatives, or an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, to whom paragraph (7)(A) applies”; and

(B) by inserting “or joint committee (as the case may be)” after “committee” each subsequent place that term appears;

(6) in paragraph (5) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or an employee on the leadership staff of the Senate” and inserting “to whom paragraph (7)(A) applies”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the following:” and all that follows through the end of clause (ii) and inserting “any Member of the leadership of the House of Representatives and any employee on the leadership staff of the House of Representatives.”

(7) in paragraph (6)(A) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection), by inserting “to whom paragraph (7)(B) applies” after “office of the Congress”;

(8) in paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and (4)” and inserting “(4), and (5)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “(5)” and inserting “(6)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(or any comparable adjustment pursuant to interim authority of the President)”; and

(iii) by striking “level 5 of the Senior Executive Service” and inserting “level IV of the Executive Schedule”;

(9) by inserting after paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) the following:

“(8) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to contacts with the staff of the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives regarding compliance with lobbying disclosure requirements under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.”; and

(10) in paragraph (9)(G) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “the Copyright Royalty Tribunal,”; and

(B) by striking “or (4)” and inserting “(4), or (5)”.

#### **SEC. 102. WRONGFULLY INFLUENCING A PRIVATE ENTITY'S EMPLOYMENT DECISIONS OR PRACTICES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### **“§ 227. Wrongfully influencing a private entity's employment decisions by a Member of Congress**

“Whoever, being a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress or an employee of either House of Congress, with the intent to influence, solely on the basis of partisan political affiliation, an employment decision or employment practice of any private entity—

“(1) takes or withholds, or offers or threatens to take or withhold, an official act, or

“(2) influences, or offers or threatens to influence, the official act of another,

shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both, and may be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.”.

(b) NO INFERENCE.—Nothing in section 227 of title 18, United States Code, as added by this section, shall be construed to create any inference with respect to whether the activity described in section 227 of title 18, United States Code, was a criminal or civil offense before the enactment of this Act, including under section 201(b), 201(c), any of sections 203 through 209, or section 872, of title 18, United States Code.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“227. Wrongfully influencing a private entity's employment decisions by a Member of Congress.”.

#### **SEC. 103. NOTIFICATION OF POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS.**

(a) NOTIFICATION OF POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS.—After a Member of Congress or an elected officer of either House of Congress leaves office, or after the termination of employment with the House of Representatives or the Senate of an employee who is covered under paragraph (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 207(e) of title 18, United States Code, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be, shall notify the Member, officer, or employee of the beginning and ending date of the prohibitions that apply to the Member, officer, or employee under section 207(e) of that title.

(b) POSTING ON INTERNET.—The Clerk of the House of Representatives, with respect to notifications under subsection (a) relating to Members, officers, and employees of the House, and the Secretary of the Senate, with

respect to such notifications relating to Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, shall post the information contained in such notifications on the public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk or the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be, in a format that, to the extent technically practicable, is searchable, sortable, and downloadable.

#### **SEC. 104. EXCEPTION TO RESTRICTIONS ON FORMER OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AND ELECTED OFFICIALS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 207(j)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “The restrictions” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The restrictions”;

(2) by moving the remaining text 2 ems to the right; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS AND INTER-TRIBAL CONSORTIUMS.—The restrictions contained in this section shall not apply to acts authorized by section 104(j) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450i(j)).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 104(j) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450i(j)) is amended to read as follows:

“(j) Anything in sections 205 and 207 of title 18, United States Code, to the contrary notwithstanding—

“(1) an officer or employee of the United States assigned to a tribal organization (as defined in section 4(1)) or an inter-tribal consortium (as defined in section 501), as authorized under section 3372 of title 5, United States Code, or section 2072 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 48) may act as agent or attorney for, and appear on behalf of, such tribal organization or inter-tribal consortium in connection with any matter related to a tribal governmental activity or Federal Indian program or service pending before any department, agency, court, or commission, including any matter in which the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest: *Provided*, That such officer or employee must advise in writing the head of the department, agency, court, or commission with which the officer or employee is dealing or appearing on behalf of the tribal organization or inter-tribal consortium of any personal and substantial involvement with the matter involved; and

“(2) a former officer or employee of the United States who is carrying out official duties as an employee or as an elected or appointed official of a tribal organization (as defined in section 4(1)) or inter-tribal consortium (as defined in section 501) may act as agent or attorney for, and appear on behalf of, such tribal organization or intra-tribal consortium in connection with any matter related to a tribal governmental activity or Federal Indian program or service pending before any department, agency, court, or commission, including any matter in which the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest: *Provided*, That such former officer or employee must advise in writing the head of the department, agency, court, or commission with which the former officer or employee is dealing or appearing on behalf of the tribal organization or inter-tribal consortium of any personal and substantial involvement the he or she may have had as an officer or employee of the United States in connection with the matter involved.”.

(c) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Except as expressly identified in this section and in the amendments made by this section, nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section affects any other provision of law.

**SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

(a) SECTION 101.—The amendments made by section 101 shall apply to individuals who leave Federal office or employment to which such amendments apply on or after the date of adjournment of the first session of the 110th Congress sine die or December 31, 2007, whichever date is earlier.

(b) SECTION 102.—The amendments made by section 102 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SECTION 103.—

(1) NOTIFICATION OF POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS.—Subsection (a) of section 103 shall take effect on the 60th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) POSTING OF INFORMATION.—Subsection (b) of section 103 shall take effect January 1, 2008, except that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall post the information contained in notifications required by that subsection that are made on or after the effective date provided under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(d) SECTION 104.—The amendments made by section 104 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that section 104(j)(2) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (as amended by section 104(b)) shall apply to individuals who leave Federal office or employment to which such amendments apply on or after the 60th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

## **TITLE II—FULL PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING**

### **SEC. 201. QUARTERLY FILING OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REPORTS.**

(a) QUARTERLY FILING REQUIRED.—Section 5 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “SEMIANNUAL” and inserting “QUARTERLY”;

(B) by striking “45 days” and all that follows through “section 4,” and inserting “20 days after the end of the quarterly period beginning on the first day of January, April, July, and October of each year in which a registrant is registered under section 4, or on the first business day after such 20th day if the 20th day is not a business day,”; and

(C) by striking “such semiannual period” and inserting “such quarterly period”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “semiannual report” and inserting “quarterly report”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “semiannual filing period” and inserting “quarterly period”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “semiannual period” and inserting “quarterly period”; and

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking “semiannual filing period” and inserting “quarterly period”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 3(10) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602) is amended by striking “six month period” and inserting “3-month period”.

(2) REGISTRATION.—Section 4 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting after “earlier,” the following: “or on the first business day after such 45th day if the 45th day is not a business day,”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(3)(A), by striking “semiannual period” and inserting “quarterly period”.

(3) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 6 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1605) is amended in paragraph (6) by striking “semiannual period” and inserting “quarterly period”.

(4) ESTIMATES.—Section 15 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1610) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “semiannual period” and inserting “quarterly period”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “semiannual period” and inserting “quarterly period”.

(5) DOLLAR AMOUNTS.—Section 4 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603) is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(A)(i), by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$2,500”;

(B) in subsection (a)(3)(A)(ii), by striking “\$20,000” and inserting “\$10,000”;

(C) in subsection (b)(3)(A), by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$5,000”; and

(D) in subsection (b)(4), by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$5,000”.

(6) REPORTS.—Section 5(c) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604(c)) is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$10,000” and “\$20,000” and inserting “\$5,000” and “\$10,000”, respectively; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$10,000” both places such term appears and inserting “\$5,000”.

### **SEC. 202. ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE.**

Section 5(b) of The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end of the following:

“(5) for each client, immediately after listing the client, an identification of whether the client is a State or local government or a department, agency, special purpose district, or other instrumentality controlled by one or more State or local governments.”.

### **SEC. 203. SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS.**

(a) OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 5 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of the semiannual period beginning on the first day of January and July of each year, or on the first business day after such 30th day if the 30th day is not a business day, each person or organization who is registered or is required to register under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 4(a), and each employee who is or is required to be listed as a lobbyist under section 4(b)(6) or subsection (b)(2)(C) of this section, shall file a report with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives containing—

“(A) the name of the person or organization;

“(B) in the case of an employee, his or her employer;

“(C) the names of all political committees established or controlled by the person or organization;

“(D) the name of each Federal candidate or officeholder, leadership PAC, or political party committee, to whom aggregate contributions equal to or exceeding \$200 were made by the person or organization, or a political committee established or controlled by the person or organization within the semiannual period, and the date and amount of each such contribution made within the semiannual period;

“(E) the date, recipient, and amount of funds contributed or disbursed during the semiannual period by the person or organization or a political committee established or controlled by the person or organization—

“(i) to pay the cost of an event to honor or recognize a covered legislative branch official or covered executive branch official,

“(ii) to an entity that is named for a covered legislative branch official, or to a person or entity in recognition of such official,

“(iii) to an entity established, financed, maintained, or controlled by a covered legislative branch official or covered executive branch official, or an entity designated by such official, or

“(iv) to pay the costs of a meeting, retreat, conference, or other similar event held by, or in the name of, 1 or more covered legislative branch officials or covered executive branch officials,

except that this subparagraph shall not apply if the funds are provided to a person who is required to report the receipt of the funds under section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434);

“(F) the name of each Presidential library foundation, and each Presidential inaugural committee, to whom contributions equal to or exceeding \$200 were made by the person or organization, or a political committee established or controlled by the person or organization, within the semiannual period, and the date and amount of each such contribution within the semiannual period; and

“(G) a certification by the person or organization filing the report that the person or organization—

“(i) has read and is familiar with those provisions of the Standing Rules of the Senate and the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the provision of gifts and travel; and

“(ii) has not provided, requested, or directed a gift, including travel, to a Member of Congress or an officer or employee of either House of Congress with knowledge that receipt of the gift would violate rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate or rule XXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘leadership PAC’ has the meaning given such term in section 304(i)(8)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the first semiannual period described in section 5(d)(1) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (as added by this section) that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act and each succeeding semiannual period.

(c) REPORT ON REQUIRING QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a report to the Congress, not later than 1 year after the date on which the first reports are required to be made under section 5(d) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (as added by this section), on the feasibility of requiring the reports under such section 5(d) to be made on a quarterly, rather than a semiannual, basis.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that after the end of the 2-year period beginning on the day on which the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section first applies, the reports required under section 5(d) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (as added by this section) should be made on a quarterly basis if it is practicably feasible to do so.

### **SEC. 204. DISCLOSURE OF BUNDLED CONTRIBUTIONS.**

(a) DISCLOSURE.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) DISCLOSURE OF BUNDLED CONTRIBUTIONS.—



“(1) **REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.**—Each committee described in paragraph (6) shall include in the first report required to be filed under this section after each covered period (as defined in paragraph (2)) a separate schedule setting forth the name, address, and employer of each person reasonably known by the committee to be a person described in paragraph (7) who provided 2 or more bundled contributions to the committee in an aggregate amount greater than the applicable threshold (as defined in paragraph (3)) during the covered period, and the aggregate amount of the bundled contributions provided by each such person during the covered period.

“(2) **COVERED PERIOD.**—In this subsection, a ‘covered period’ means, with respect to a committee—

“(A) the period beginning January 1 and ending June 30 of each year;

“(B) the period beginning July 1 and ending December 31 of each year; and

“(C) any reporting period applicable to the committee under this section during which any person described in paragraph (7) provided 2 or more bundled contributions to the committee in an aggregate amount greater than the applicable threshold.

“(3) **APPLICABLE THRESHOLD.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In this subsection, the ‘applicable threshold’ is \$15,000, except that in determining whether the amount of bundled contributions provided to a committee by a person described in paragraph (7) exceeds the applicable threshold, there shall be excluded any contribution made to the committee by the person or the person’s spouse.

“(B) **INDEXING.**—In any calendar year after 2007, section 315(c)(1)(B) shall apply to the amount applicable under subparagraph (A) in the same manner as such section applies to the limitations established under subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(3), and (h) of such section, except that for purposes of applying such section to the amount applicable under subparagraph (A), the ‘base period’ shall be 2006.

“(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Commission shall ensure that, to the greatest extent practicable—

“(A) information required to be disclosed under this subsection is publicly available through the Commission website in a manner that is searchable, sortable, and downloadable; and

“(B) the Commission’s public database containing information disclosed under this subsection is linked electronically to the websites maintained by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives containing information filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

“(5) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to implement this subsection. Under such regulations, the Commission—

“(A) may, notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), provide for quarterly filing of the schedule described in paragraph (1) by a committee which files reports under this section more frequently than on a quarterly basis;

“(B) shall provide guidance to committees with respect to whether a person is reasonably known by a committee to be a person described in paragraph (7), which shall include a requirement that committees consult the websites maintained by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives containing information filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995;

“(C) may not exempt the activity of a person described in paragraph (7) from disclo-

sure under this subsection on the grounds that the person is authorized to engage in fundraising for the committee or any other similar grounds; and

“(D) shall provide for the broadest possible disclosure of activities described in this subsection by persons described in paragraph (7) that is consistent with this subsection.

“(6) **COMMITTEES DESCRIBED.**—A committee described in this paragraph is an authorized committee of a candidate, a leadership PAC, or a political party committee.

“(7) **PERSONS DESCRIBED.**—A person described in this paragraph is any person, who, at the time a contribution is forwarded to a committee as described in paragraph (8)(A)(i) or is received by a committee as described in paragraph (8)(A)(ii), is—

“(A) a current registrant under section 4(a) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995;

“(B) an individual who is listed on a current registration filed under section 4(b)(6) of such Act or a current report under section 5(b)(2)(C) of such Act; or

“(C) a political committee established or controlled by such a registrant or individual.

“(8) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the following definitions apply:

“(A) **BUNDLED CONTRIBUTION.**—The term ‘bundled contribution’ means, with respect to a committee described in paragraph (6) and a person described in paragraph (7), a contribution (subject to the applicable threshold) which is—

“(i) forwarded from the contributor or contributors to the committee by the person; or

“(ii) received by the committee from a contributor or contributors, but credited by the committee or candidate involved (or, in the case of a leadership PAC, by the individual referred to in subparagraph (B) involved) to the person through records, designations, or other means of recognizing that a certain amount of money has been raised by the person.

“(B) **LEADERSHIP PAC.**—The term ‘leadership PAC’ means, with respect to a candidate for election to Federal office or an individual holding Federal office, a political committee that is directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained or controlled by the candidate or the individual but which is not an authorized committee of the candidate or individual and which is not affiliated with an authorized committee of the candidate or individual, except that such term does not include a political committee of a political party.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to reports filed under section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act after the expiration of the 3-month period which begins on the date that the regulations required to be promulgated by the Federal Election Commission under section 304(i)(5) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)) become final.

#### SEC. 205. ELECTRONIC FILING OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REPORTS.

Section 5 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **ELECTRONIC FILING REQUIRED.**—A report required to be filed under this section shall be filed in electronic form, in addition to any other form that the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives may require or allow. The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall use the same electronic software for receipt and recording of filings under this Act.”

#### SEC. 206. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF GIFTS OR TRAVEL BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND TO CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 25. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF GIFTS OR TRAVEL BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND TO CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

“(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Any person described in subsection (b) may not make a gift or provide travel to a covered legislative branch official if the person has knowledge that the gift or travel may not be accepted by that covered legislative branch official under the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Standing Rules of the Senate (as the case may be).

“(b) **PERSONS SUBJECT TO PROHIBITION.**—The persons subject to the prohibition under subsection (a) are any lobbyist that is registered or is required to register under section 4(a)(1), any organization that employs 1 or more lobbyists and is registered or is required to register under section 4(a)(2), and any employee listed or required to be listed as a lobbyist by a registrant under section 4(b)(6) or 5(b)(2)(C).”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 207. DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES BY CERTAIN COALITIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **DISCLOSURE.**—Section 4(b)(3) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(b)(3)) is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) contributes more than \$5,000 to the registrant or the client in the quarterly period to fund the lobbying activities of the registrant; and”;

(B) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) actively participates in the planning, supervision, or control of such lobbying activities.”

(2) **UPDATING OF INFORMATION.**—Section 5(b)(1) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604(b)(1)) is amended by inserting “, including information under section 4(b)(3)” after “initial registration”.

(b) **NO DONOR OR MEMBERSHIP LIST DISCLOSURE.**—Section 4(b) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“No disclosure is required under paragraph (3)(B) if the organization that would be identified as affiliated with the client is listed on the client’s publicly accessible Internet website as being a member of or contributor to the client, unless the organization in whole or in major part plans, supervises, or controls such lobbying activities. If a registrant relies upon the preceding sentence, the registrant must disclose the specific Internet address of the web page containing the information relied upon. Nothing in paragraph (3)(B) shall be construed to require the disclosure of any information about individuals who are members of, or donors to, an entity treated as a client by this Act or an organization identified under that paragraph.”

#### SEC. 208. DISCLOSURE BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS OF PAST EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT.

Section 4(b)(6) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(b)(6)) is amended by striking “in the 2 years” and all that follows through “(Act)” and inserting “in the 20

years before the date on which the employee first acted”.

**SEC. 209. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE INFORMATION; MAINTENANCE OF INFORMATION.**

(a) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Section 6 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1605) is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(9) maintain all registrations and reports filed under this Act, and make them available to the public over the Internet, without a fee or other access charge, in a searchable, sortable, and downloadable manner, to the extent technically practicable, that—

“(A) includes the information contained in the registrations and reports;

“(B) is searchable and sortable to the maximum extent practicable, including searchable and sortable by each of the categories of information described in section 4(b) or 5(b); and

“(C) provides electronic links or other appropriate mechanisms to allow users to obtain relevant information in the database of the Federal Election Commission; and

“(10) retain the information contained in a registration or report filed under this Act for a period of 6 years after the registration or report (as the case may be) is filed.”.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.**—Section 6(4) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1605) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and, in the case of a report filed in electronic form under section 5(e), make such report available for public inspection over the Internet as soon as technically practicable after the report is so filed”.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out paragraph (9) of section 6 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1605), as added by subsection (a) of this section.

**SEC. 210. DISCLOSURE OF ENFORCEMENT FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.**

Section 6 of The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1605) is further amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary”;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in paragraph (10), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) make publicly available, on a semi-annual basis, the aggregate number of registrants referred to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia for non-compliance as required by paragraph (8).”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **ENFORCEMENT REPORT.**—

“(1) **REPORT.**—The Attorney General shall report to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (2), after the end of each semiannual period beginning on January 1 and July 1, the aggregate number of enforcement actions taken by the Department of Justice under this Act during that semi-annual period and, by case, any sentences imposed, except that such report shall not include the names of individuals, or personally identifiable information, that is not already a matter of public record.

“(2) **COMMITTEES.**—The congressional committees referred to in paragraph (1) are the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.”.

**SEC. 211. INCREASED CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1606) is amended—

(1) by striking “Whoever” and inserting “(a) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—Whoever”;

(2) by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$200,000”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **CRIMINAL PENALTY.**—Whoever knowingly and corruptly fails to comply with any provision of this Act shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any violation committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 212. ELECTRONIC FILING AND PUBLIC DATABASE FOR LOBBYISTS FOR FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.**

(a) **ELECTRONIC FILING.**—Section 2 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 612), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) **ELECTRONIC FILING OF REGISTRATION STATEMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTS.**—A registration statement or supplement required to be filed under this section shall be filed in electronic form, in addition to any other form that may be required by the Attorney General.”.

(b) **PUBLIC DATABASE.**—Section 6 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 616), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **PUBLIC DATABASE OF REGISTRATION STATEMENTS AND UPDATES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General shall maintain, and make available to the public over the Internet, without a fee or other access charge, in a searchable, sortable, and downloadable manner, to the extent technically practicable, an electronic database that—

“(A) includes the information contained in registration statements and updates filed under this Act; and

“(B) is searchable and sortable, at a minimum, by each of the categories of information described in section 2(a).

“(2) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—The Attorney General shall make each registration statement and update filed in electronic form pursuant to section 2(g) available for public inspection over the Internet as soon as technically practicable after the registration statement or update is filed.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 213. COMPTROLLER GENERAL AUDIT AND ANNUAL REPORT.**

(a) **ANNUAL AUDITS AND REPORTS.**—The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report on the review required by subsection (a) for the preceding calendar year. The report shall include the Comptroller General’s assessment

of the matters required to be emphasized by that subsection and any recommendations of the Comptroller General to—

“(A) improve the compliance by lobbyists, lobbying firms, and registrants with the requirements of this Act; and

“(B) provide the Department of Justice with the resources and authorities needed for the effective enforcement of this Act.

“(2) **ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE.**—The annual report under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of compliance by registrants with the requirements of section 4(b)(3).

“(c) **ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**—The Comptroller General may, in carrying out this section, request information from and access to any relevant documents from any person registered under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 4(a) and each employee who is listed as a lobbyist under section 4(b)(6) or section 5(b)(2)(C) if the material requested relates to the purposes of this section. The Comptroller General may request such person to submit in writing such information as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may notify the Congress in writing if a person from whom information has been requested under this subsection refuses to comply with the request within 45 days after the request is made.”.

(b) **INITIAL AUDIT AND REPORT.**—The initial audit under subsection (a) of section 26 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (as added by subsection (a) of this section) shall be made with respect to lobbying registrations and reports filed during the first calendar quarter of 2008, and the initial report under subsection (b) of such section shall be filed, with respect to those registrations and reports, not later than 6 months after the end of that calendar quarter.

**SEC. 214. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the use of a family relationship by a lobbyist who is an immediate family member of a Member of Congress to gain special advantages over other lobbyists is inappropriate; and

(2) the lobbying community should develop proposals for multiple self-regulatory organizations which could—

(A) provide for the creation of standards for the organizations appropriate to the type of lobbying and individuals to be served;

(B) provide training for the lobbying community on law, ethics, reporting requirements, and disclosure requirements;

(C) provide for the development of educational materials for the public on how to responsibly hire a lobbyist or lobby firm;

(D) provide standards regarding reasonable fees charged to clients;

(E) provide for the creation of a third-party certification program that includes ethics training; and

(F) provide for disclosure of requirements to clients regarding fee schedules and conflict of interest rules.

**SEC. 215. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Except as otherwise provided in sections 203, 204, 206, 211, 212, and 213, the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to registrations under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 having an effective date of January 1, 2008, or later and with respect to quarterly reports under that Act covering calendar quarters beginning on or after January 1, 2008.

**TITLE III—MATTERS RELATING TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**SEC. 301. DISCLOSURE BY MEMBERS AND STAFF OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by redesignating rules XXVII and XXVIII as rules XXVIII and XXIX, respectively, and by inserting after rule XXVI the following new rule:

## "RULE XXVII

"DISCLOSURE BY MEMBERS AND STAFF OF  
EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS

"1. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall not directly negotiate or have any agreement of future employment or compensation until after his or her successor has been elected, unless such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, within 3 business days after the commencement of such negotiation or agreement of future employment or compensation, files with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct a statement, which must be signed by the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, regarding such negotiations or agreement, including the name of the private entity or entities involved in such negotiations or agreement, and the date such negotiations or agreement commenced.

"2. An officer or an employee of the House earning in excess of 75 percent of the salary paid to a Member shall notify the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct that he or she is negotiating or has any agreement of future employment or compensation.

"3. The disclosure and notification under this rule shall be made within 3 business days after the commencement of such negotiation or agreement of future employment or compensation.

"4. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, and an officer or employee to whom this rule applies, shall recuse himself or herself from any matter in which there is a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict for that Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee under this rule and shall notify the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of such recusal. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such recusal shall, upon such recusal, submit to the Clerk for public disclosure the statement of disclosure under clause 1 with respect to which the recusal was made."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to negotiations commenced, and agreements entered into, on or after that date.

**SEC. 302. PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING CONTACTS  
WITH SPOUSE OF MEMBER WHO IS A  
REGISTERED LOBBYIST.**

Rule XXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"7. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall prohibit all staff employed by that Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner (including staff in personal, committee, and leadership offices) from making any lobbying contact (as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995) with that individual's spouse if that spouse is a lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or is employed or retained by such a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing legislation."

**SEC. 303. TREATMENT OF FIRMS AND OTHER  
BUSINESSES WHOSE MEMBERS  
SERVE AS HOUSE COMMITTEE CON-  
SULTANTS.**

Clause 18(b) of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following: "In the case of such an individual who is a member or employee of a firm, partnership, or other business organization, the other members and employees of the firm, partnership, or other business organization shall be subject to the same restrictions on lobbying that apply to the individual under this paragraph."

**SEC. 304. POSTING OF TRAVEL AND FINANCIAL  
DISCLOSURE REPORTS ON PUBLIC  
WEBSITE OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) REQUIRING POSTING ON INTERNET.—The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall

post on the public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk, in a format that is searchable, sortable, and downloadable, to the extent technically practicable, each of the following:

(1) The advance authorizations, certifications, and disclosures filed with respect to transportation, lodging, and related expenses for travel under clause 5(b) of rule XXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives by Members (including Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress), officers, and employees of the House.

(2) The reports filed under section 103(h)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 by Members of the House of Representatives (including Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress).

## (b) APPLICABILITY AND TIMING.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—Subject to paragraph (2), subsection (a) shall apply with respect to information received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TIMING.—The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall—

(A) not later than August 1, 2008, post the information required by subsection (a) that the Clerk receives by June 1, 2008; and

(B) not later than the end of each 45-day period occurring after information is required to be posted under subparagraph (A), post the information required by subsection (a) that the Clerk has received since the last posting under this subsection.

(3) OMISSION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—Members of the House of Representatives (including Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress) shall be permitted to omit personally identifiable information not required to be disclosed on the reports posted on the public Internet site under this section (such as home address, Social Security numbers, personal bank account numbers, home telephone, and names of children) prior to the posting of such reports on such public Internet site.

(4) ASSISTANCE IN PROTECTING PERSONAL INFORMATION.—The Clerk of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, shall include in any informational materials concerning any disclosure that will be posted on the public Internet site under this section an explanation of the procedures for protecting personally identifiable information as described in this section.

(c) RETENTION.—The Clerk shall maintain the information posted on the public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk under this section for a period of 6 years after receiving the information.

**SEC. 305. PROHIBITING PARTICIPATION IN LOBBY-  
SPONSORED EVENTS DURING  
POLITICAL CONVENTIONS.**

Rule XXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as amended by section 302, is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"8. During the dates on which the national political party to which a Member (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner) belongs holds its convention to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, the Member may not participate in an event honoring that Member, other than in his or her capacity as a candidate for such office, if such event is directly paid for by a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or a private entity that retains or employs such a registered lobbyist."

**SEC. 306. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.**

The provisions of this title are adopted by the House of Representatives—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

**TITLE IV—CONGRESSIONAL PENSION  
ACCOUNTABILITY****SEC. 401. LOSS OF PENSIONS ACCRUED DURING  
SERVICE AS A MEMBER OF CON-  
GRESS FOR ABUSING THE PUBLIC  
TRUST.**

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(o)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, the service of an individual finally convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not be taken into account for purposes of this subchapter, except that this sentence applies only to service rendered as a Member (irrespective of when rendered). Any such individual (or other person determined under section 8342(c), if applicable) shall be entitled to be paid so much of such individual's lump-sum credit as is attributable to service to which the preceding sentence applies.

"(2)(A) An offense described in this paragraph is any offense described in subparagraph (B) for which the following apply:

"(i) Every act or omission of the individual (referred to in paragraph (1)) that is needed to satisfy the elements of the offense occurs while the individual is a Member.

"(ii) Every act or omission of the individual that is needed to satisfy the elements of the offense directly relates to the performance of the individual's official duties as a Member.

"(iii) The offense is committed after the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(B) An offense described in this subparagraph is only the following, and only to the extent that the offense is a felony:

"(i) An offense under section 201 of title 18 (relating to bribery of public officials and witnesses).

"(ii) An offense under section 219 of title 18 (relating to officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals).

"(iii) An offense under section 1343 of title 18 (relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television, including as part of a scheme to deprive citizens of honest services thereby).

"(iv) An offense under section 104(a) of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (relating to prohibited foreign trade practices by domestic concerns).

"(v) An offense under section 1957 of title 18 (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity).

"(vi) An offense under section 1512 of title 18 (relating to tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant).

"(vii) An offense under chapter 96 of title 18 (relating to racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations).

"(viii) An offense under section 371 of title 18 (relating to conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States), to the extent of any conspiracy to commit an act which constitutes—

"(I) an offense under clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), or (vii); or

"(II) an offense under section 207 of title 18 (relating to restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches).

"(ix) Perjury committed under section 1621 of title 18 in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes—

"(I) an offense under clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), or (vii); or

"(II) an offense under clause (viii), to the extent provided in such clause.

"(x) Subornation of perjury committed under section 1622 of title 18 in connection

with the false denial or false testimony of another individual as specified in clause (ix).

“(3) An individual convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not, after the date of the final conviction, be eligible to participate in the retirement system under this subchapter or chapter 84 while serving as a Member.

“(4) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection. Such regulations shall include—

“(A) provisions under which interest on any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) shall be limited in a manner similar to that specified in the last sentence of section 8316(b); and

“(B) provisions under which the Office may provide for—

“(i) the payment, to the spouse or children of any individual referred to in the first sentence of paragraph (1), of any amounts which (but for this clause) would otherwise have been nonpayable by reason of such first sentence, subject to paragraph (5); and

“(ii) an appropriate adjustment in the amount of any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) to reflect the application of clause (i).

“(5) Regulations to carry out clause (i) of paragraph (4)(B) shall include provisions to ensure that the authority to make any payment to the spouse or children of an individual under such clause shall be available only to the extent that the application of such clause is considered necessary and appropriate taking into account the totality of the circumstances, including the financial needs of the spouse or children, whether the spouse or children participated in an offense described in paragraph (2) of which such individual was finally convicted, and what measures, if any, may be necessary to ensure that the convicted individual does not benefit from any such payment.

“(6) For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘finally convicted’ and ‘final conviction’ refer to a conviction (i) which has not been appealed and is no longer appealable because the time for taking an appeal has expired, or (ii) which has been appealed and the appeals process for which is completed;

“(B) the term ‘Member’ has the meaning given such term by section 2106, notwithstanding section 8331(2); and

“(C) the term ‘child’ has the meaning given such term by section 8341.”

(b) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEM.**—Section 8411 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the service of an individual finally convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not be taken into account for purposes of this chapter, except that this sentence applies only to service rendered as a Member (irrespective of when rendered). Any such individual (or other person determined under section 8424(d), if applicable) shall be entitled to be paid so much of such individual’s lump-sum credit as is attributable to service to which the preceding sentence applies.

“(2) An offense described in this paragraph is any offense described in section 8332(o)(2)(B) for which the following apply:

“(A) Every act or omission of the individual (referred to in paragraph (1)) that is needed to satisfy the elements of the offense occurs while the individual is a Member.

“(B) Every act or omission of the individual that is needed to satisfy the elements of the offense directly relates to the performance of the individual’s official duties as a Member.

“(C) The offense is committed after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(3) An individual convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not, after the date of the final conviction, be eligible to participate in the retirement system under this chapter while serving as a Member.

“(4) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection. Such regulations shall include—

“(A) provisions under which interest on any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) shall be limited in a manner similar to that specified in the last sentence of section 8316(b); and

“(B) provisions under which the Office may provide for—

“(i) the payment, to the spouse or children of any individual referred to in the first sentence of paragraph (1), of any amounts which (but for this clause) would otherwise have been nonpayable by reason of such first sentence, subject to paragraph (5); and

“(ii) an appropriate adjustment in the amount of any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) to reflect the application of clause (i).

“(5) Regulations to carry out clause (i) of paragraph (4)(B) shall include provisions to ensure that the authority to make any payment under such clause to the spouse or children of an individual shall be available only to the extent that the application of such clause is considered necessary and appropriate taking into account the totality of the circumstances, including the financial needs of the spouse or children, whether the spouse or children participated in an offense described in paragraph (2) of which such individual was finally convicted, and what measures, if any, may be necessary to ensure that the convicted individual does not benefit from any such payment.

“(6) For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘finally convicted’ and ‘final conviction’ refer to a conviction (i) which has not been appealed and is no longer appealable because the time for taking an appeal has expired, or (ii) which has been appealed and the appeals process for which is completed;

“(B) the term ‘Member’ has the meaning given such term by section 2106, notwithstanding section 8401(20); and

“(C) the term ‘child’ has the meaning given such term by section 8441.”

## **TITLE V—SENATE LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **Subtitle A—Procedural Reform**

#### **SEC. 511. AMENDMENTS TO RULE XXVIII.**

(a) **OUT OF SCOPE MATERIAL AMENDMENT.**—Rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs 4 through 6 as paragraphs 6 through 8, respectively; and

(2) striking paragraphs 2 and 3 and inserting the following:

“2. (a) Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses.

“(b) If matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report is rejected or shall be recommitted to the committee of conference if the House of Representatives has not already acted thereon.

“(c) If new matter is inserted in the report, a point of order may be made against the conference report and it shall be disposed of as provided under paragraph 4.

“3.(a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees—

“(1) it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter;

“(2) the conferees may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House; and

“(3) the conferees may include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

“(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subparagraph (a), a point of order may be made against the conference report and it shall be disposed of as provided under paragraph 4.

“4.(a) A Senator may raise a point of order that one or more provisions of a conference report violates paragraph 2 or paragraph 3, as the case may be. The Presiding Officer may sustain the point of order as to some or all of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order.

“(b) If the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order as to any of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order, then those provisions against which the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order shall be stricken. After all other points of order under this paragraph have been disposed of—

“(1) the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate should recede from its amendment to the House bill, or its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and concur with a further amendment, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report that has not been stricken;

“(2) the question in clause (1) shall be decided under the same debate limitation as the conference report; and

“(3) no further amendment shall be in order.

“5.(a) Any Senator may move to waive any or all points of order under paragraph 2 or 3 with respect to the pending conference report by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. All motions to waive under this paragraph shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 1 hour equally divided between the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. A motion to waive all points of order under this paragraph shall not be amendable.

“(b) All appeals from rulings of the Chair under paragraph 4 shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 1 hour, equally divided between the Majority and the Minority Leader or their designees. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair under paragraph 4.”

(b) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AMENDMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“9. (a)(1) It shall not be in order to vote on the adoption of a report of a committee of conference unless such report has been available to Members and to the general public for at least 48 hours before such vote. If a point of order is sustained under this paragraph, then the conference report shall be set aside.

“(2) For purposes of this paragraph, a report of a committee of conference is made available to the general public as of the time it is posted on a publicly accessible website controlled by a Member, committee, Library of Congress, or other office of Congress, or the Government Printing Office, as reported to the Presiding Officer by the Secretary of the Senate.

“(b)(1) This paragraph may be waived in the Senate with respect to the pending conference report by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. A motion to waive this paragraph shall be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour equally divided between the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees.

“(2) An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this paragraph. An appeal of the ruling of the Chair shall be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour equally divided between the Majority and the Minority Leader or their designees.”

“(c) This paragraph may be waived by joint agreement of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, upon their certification that such waiver is necessary as a result of a significant disruption to Senate facilities or to the availability of the Internet.”.

(2) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Committee on Rules and Administration, in consultation with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Government Printing Office shall promulgate regulations for the implementation of the requirements of paragraph 9 of rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as added by this section.

#### **SEC. 512. NOTICE OF OBJECTING TO PROCEEDING.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate or their designees shall recognize a notice of intent of a Senator who is a member of their caucus to object to proceeding to a measure or matter only if the Senator—

(1) following the objection to a unanimous consent to proceeding to, and, or passage of, a measure or matter on their behalf, submits the notice of intent in writing to the appropriate leader or their designee; and

(2) not later than 6 session days after the submission under paragraph (1), submits for inclusion in the Congressional Record and in the applicable calendar section described in subsection (b) the following notice:

“I, Senator \_\_\_\_\_, intend to object to proceedings to \_\_\_\_\_, dated \_\_\_\_\_ for the following reasons \_\_\_\_\_.”.

(b) **CALNDAR.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Senate shall establish for both the Senate Calendar of Business and the Senate Executive Calendar a separate section entitled “Notice of Intent to Object to Proceeding”.

(2) **CONTENT.**—The section required by paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the name of each Senator filing a notice under subsection (a)(2);

(B) the measure or matter covered by the calendar that the Senator objects to; and

(C) the date the objection was filed.

(3) **NOTICE.**—A Senator who has notified their respective leader and who has withdrawn their objection within the 6 session day period is not required to submit a notification under subsection (a)(2).

(c) **REMOVAL.**—A Senator may have an item with respect to the Senator removed from a calendar to which it was added under subsection (b) by submitting for inclusion in the Congressional Record the following notice:

“I, Senator \_\_\_\_\_, do not object to proceed to \_\_\_\_\_, dated \_\_\_\_\_.”.

#### **SEC. 513. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF SENATE COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph 5(e) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) inserting after “(e)” the following: “(1)”; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) Except with respect to meetings closed in accordance with this rule, each committee and subcommittee shall make publicly available through the Internet a video recording, audio recording, or transcript of any meeting not later than 21 business days after the meeting occurs.

“(B) Information required by subclause (A) shall be available until the end of the Congress following the date of the meeting.

“(C) The Committee on Rules and Administration may waive this clause upon request based on the inability of a committee or subcommittee to comply with this clause due to technical or logistical reasons.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### **SEC. 514. AMENDMENTS AND MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT.**

Paragraph 1 of rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

“1.(a) An amendment and any instruction accompanying a motion to recommit shall be reduced to writing and read and identical copies shall be provided by the Senator offering the amendment or instruction to the desks of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader before being debated.

“(b) A motion shall be reduced to writing, if desired by the Presiding Officer or by any Senator, and shall be read before being debated.”.

#### **SEC. 515. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONFERENCE COMMITTEE PROTOCOLS.**

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) conference committees should hold regular, formal meetings of all conferees that are open to the public;

(2) all conferees should be given adequate notice of the time and place of all such meetings;

(3) all conferees should be afforded an opportunity to participate in full and complete debates of the matters that such conference committees may recommend to their respective Houses; and

(4) the text of a report of a committee of conference shall not be changed after the Senate signature sheets have been signed by a majority of the Senate conferees.

#### **Subtitle B—Earmark Reform**

#### **SEC. 521. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING.**

The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end the following:

##### **“RULE XLIV**

##### **“CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING AND RELATED ITEMS**

“1.(a) It shall not be in order to vote on a motion to proceed to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by any committee unless the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction or the Majority Leader or his or her designee certifies—

“(1) that each congressionally directed spending item, limited tax benefit, and limited tariff benefit, if any, in the bill or joint resolution, or in the committee report accompanying the bill or joint resolution, has been identified through lists, charts, or other similar means including the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the committee for each item so identified; and

“(2) that the information in clause (1) has been available on a publicly accessible congressional website in a searchable format at least 48 hours before such vote.

“(b) If a point of order is sustained under this paragraph, the motion to proceed shall be suspended until the sponsor of the motion or his or her designee has requested resumption and compliance with this paragraph has been achieved.

“2.(a) It shall not be in order to vote on a motion to proceed to consider a Senate bill or joint resolution not reported by committee unless the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction or the Majority Leader or his or her designee certifies—

“(1) that each congressionally directed spending item, limited tax benefit, and lim-

ited tariff benefit, if any, in the bill or joint resolution, has been identified through lists, charts, or other similar means, including the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the sponsor of the bill or joint resolution for each item so identified; and

“(2) that the information in clause (1) has been available on a publicly accessible congressional website in a searchable format at least 48 hours before such vote.

“(b) If a point of order is sustained under this paragraph, the motion to proceed shall be suspended until the sponsor of the motion or his or her designee has requested resumption and compliance with this paragraph has been achieved.

“3.(a) It shall not be in order to vote on the adoption of a report of a committee of conference unless the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction or the Majority Leader or his or her designee certifies—

“(1) that each congressionally directed spending item, limited tax benefit, and limited tariff benefit, if any, in the conference report, or in the joint statement of managers accompanying the conference report, has been identified through lists, charts, or other means, including the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the committee of jurisdiction for each item so identified; and

“(2) that the information in clause (1) has been available on a publicly accessible congressional website at least 48 hours before such vote.

“(b) If a point of order is sustained under this paragraph, then the conference report shall be set aside.

“4.(a) If during consideration of a bill or joint resolution, a Senator proposes an amendment containing a congressionally directed spending item, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit which was not included in the bill or joint resolution as placed on the calendar or as reported by any committee, in a committee report on such bill or joint resolution, or a committee report of the Senate on a companion measure, then as soon as practicable, the Senator shall ensure that a list of such items (and the name of any Senator who submitted a request to the Senator for each respective item included in the list) is printed in the Congressional Record.

“(b) If a committee reports a bill or joint resolution that includes congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits in the bill or joint resolution, or in the committee report accompanying the bill or joint resolution, the committee shall as soon as practicable identify on a publicly accessible congressional website each such item through lists, charts, or other similar means, including the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the committee for each item so identified. Availability on the Internet of a committee report that contains the information described in this subparagraph shall satisfy the requirements of this subparagraph.

“(c) To the extent technically feasible, information made available on publicly accessible congressional websites under paragraphs 3 and 4 shall be provided in a searchable format.

“5. For the purpose of this rule—

“(a) the term ‘congressionally directed spending item’ means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process;

“(b) the term ‘limited tax benefit’ means—  
“(1) any revenue provision that—

“(A) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to a particular beneficiary or limited group of beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(B) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision;

“(c) the term ‘limited tariff benefit’ means a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities; and

“(d) except as used in subparagraph 8(e), the term ‘item’ when not preceded by ‘congressionally directed spending’ means any provision that is a congressionally directed spending item, a limited tax benefit, or a limited tariff benefit.

“(6)(a) A Senator who requests a congressionally directed spending item, a limited tax benefit, or a limited tariff benefit in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report (or an accompanying joint statement of managers) shall provide a written statement to the chairman and ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction, including—

“(1) the name of the Senator;

“(2) in the case of a congressionally directed spending item, the name and location of the intended recipient or, if there is no specifically intended recipient, the intended location of the activity;

“(3) in the case of a limited tax or tariff benefit, identification of the individual or entities reasonably anticipated to benefit, to the extent known to the Senator;

“(4) the purpose of such congressionally directed spending item or limited tax or tariff benefit; and

“(5) a certification that neither the Senator nor the Senator's immediate family has a pecuniary interest in the item, consistent with the requirements of paragraph 9.

“(b) With respect to each item included in a Senate bill or joint resolution (or accompanying report) reported by committee or considered by the Senate, or included in a conference report (or joint statement of managers accompanying the conference report) considered by the Senate, each committee of jurisdiction shall make available for public inspection on the Internet the certifications under subparagraph (a)(5) as soon as practicable.

“(7) In the case of a bill, joint resolution, or conference report that contains congressionally directed spending items in any classified portion of a report accompanying the measure, the committee of jurisdiction shall, to the greatest extent practicable, consistent with the need to protect national security (including intelligence sources and methods), include on the list required by paragraph 1, 2, or 3 as the case may be, a general program description in unclassified language, funding level, and the name of the sponsor of that congressionally directed spending item.

“(8)(a) A Senator may raise a point of order against one or more provisions of a conference report if they constitute new directed spending provisions. The Presiding Officer may sustain the point of order as to some or all of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order.

“(b) If the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order as to any of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order, then those provisions against which the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order shall be stricken. After all other points of order under this paragraph have been disposed of—

“(1) the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate should recede from its amendment to the House bill,

or its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and concur with a further amendment, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report that has not been stricken; and

“(2) the question in clause (1) shall be decided under the same debate limitation as the conference report and no further amendment shall be in order.

“(c) Any Senator may move to waive any or all points of order under this paragraph with respect to the pending conference report by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. All motions to waive under this paragraph shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 1 hour equally divided between the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. A motion to waive all points of order under this paragraph shall not be amendable.

“(d) All appeals from rulings of the Chair under this paragraph shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 1 hour, equally divided between the Majority and the Minority Leader or their designees. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair under this paragraph.

“(e) The term ‘new directed spending provision’ as used in this paragraph means any item that consists of a specific provision containing a specific level of funding for any specific account, specific program, specific project, or specific activity, when no specific funding was provided for such specific account, specific program, specific project, or specific activity in the measure originally committed to the conferees by either House.

“(9) No Member, officer, or employee of the Senate shall knowingly use his official position to introduce, request, or otherwise aid the progress or passage of congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits a principal purpose of which is to further only his pecuniary interest, only the pecuniary interest of his immediate family, or only the pecuniary interest of a limited class of persons or enterprises, when he or his immediate family, or enterprises controlled by them, are members of the affected class.

“(10) Any Senator may move to waive application of paragraph 1, 2, or 3 with respect to a measure by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. A motion to waive under this paragraph with respect to a measure shall be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour equally divided between the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. With respect to points of order raised under paragraphs 1, 2, or 3, only one appeal from a ruling of the Chair shall be in order, and debate on such an appeal from a ruling of the Chair on such point of order shall be limited to one hour.

“(11) Any Senator may move to waive all points of order under this rule with respect to the pending measure or motion by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. All motions to waive all points of order with respect to a measure or motion as provided by this paragraph shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 1 hour equally divided between the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. A motion to waive all points of order with respect to a measure or motion as provided by this paragraph shall not be amendable.

“(12) Paragraph 1, 2, or 3 of this rule may be waived by joint agreement of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate upon their certification that such waiver is necessary as a result of a significant disruption to Senate facilities or to the availability of the Internet.”.

### Subtitle C—Revolving Door Reform

#### SEC. 531. POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS.

(a) APPLICATION TO ENTITY.—Paragraph 8 of rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) inserting after “by such a registered lobbyist” the following “or an entity that employs or retains a registered lobbyist”; and

(2) striking “one year” and inserting “2 years”.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Paragraph 9 of rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting after “by such a registered lobbyist” the following: “or an entity that employs or retains a registered lobbyist”;

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting after “by such a registered lobbyist” the following: “or an entity that employs or retains a registered lobbyist”;

(3) by designating the first and second sentences as subparagraphs (a) and (b), respectively; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) If an officer of the Senate or an employee on the staff of a Member or on the staff of a committee whose rate of pay is equal to or greater than 75 percent of the rate of pay of a Member and employed at such rate for more than 60 days in a calendar year, upon leaving that position, becomes a registered lobbyist, or is employed or retained by such a registered lobbyist or an entity that employs or retains a registered lobbyist for the purpose of influencing legislation, such employee may not lobby any Member, officer, or employee of the Senate for a period of 1 year after leaving that position.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph 9(c) of rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall apply to individuals who leave office or employment to which such paragraph applies on or after the date of adjournment of the first session of the 110th Congress sine die or December 31, 2007, whichever date is earlier.

#### SEC. 532. DISCLOSURE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND STAFF OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS.

Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraph 12 as paragraph 13; and

(2) adding after paragraph 11 the following:

“(12)(a) A Member shall not negotiate or have any arrangement concerning prospective private employment until after his or her successor has been elected, unless such Member files a signed statement with the Secretary of the Senate, for public disclosure, regarding such negotiations or arrangements not later than 3 business days after the commencement of such negotiation or arrangement, including the name of the private entity or entities involved in such negotiations or arrangements, and the date such negotiations or arrangements commenced.

“(b) A Member shall not negotiate or have any arrangement concerning prospective employment for a job involving lobbying activities as defined by the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 until after his or her successor has been elected.

“(c)(1) An employee of the Senate earning in excess of 75 percent of the salary paid to a Senator shall notify the Select Committee on Ethics that he or she is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective private employment.

“(2) The notification under this subparagraph shall be made not later than 3 business days after the commencement of such negotiation or arrangement.

“(3) An employee to whom this subparagraph applies shall—



“(A) recuse himself or herself from—

“(i) any contact or communication with the prospective employer on issues of legislative interest to the prospective employer; and

“(ii) any legislative matter in which there is a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict for that employee under this subparagraph; and

“(B) notify the Select Committee on Ethics of such recusal.”.

**SEC. 533. ELIMINATION OF FLOOR PRIVILEGES FOR FORMER MEMBERS, SENATE OFFICERS, AND SPEAKERS OF THE HOUSE WHO ARE REGISTERED LOBBYISTS OR SEEK FINANCIAL GAIN.**

Rule XXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) inserting “1.” before “Other”;

(2) inserting after “Ex-Senators and Senators-elect” the following: “, except as provided in paragraph 2”;

(3) inserting after “Ex-Secretaries and ex-Sergeants at Arms of the Senate” the following: “, except as provided in paragraph 2”;

(4) inserting after “Ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives” the following: “, except as provided in paragraph 2”;

(5) adding at the end the following:

“2.(a) The floor privilege provided in paragraph 1 shall not apply, when the Senate is in session, to an individual covered by this paragraph who is—

“(1) a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal; or

“(2) in the employ of or represents any party or organization for the purpose of influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage, defeat, or amendment of any Federal legislative proposal.

“(b) The Committee on Rules and Administration may promulgate regulations to allow individuals covered by this paragraph floor privileges for ceremonial functions and events designated by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader.

“3. A former Member of the Senate may not exercise privileges to use Senate athletic facilities or Member-only parking spaces if such Member is—

“(a) a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal; or

“(b) in the employ of or represents any party or organization for the purpose of influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage, defeat, or amendment of any Federal legislative proposal.”.

**SEC. 534. INFLUENCING HIRING DECISIONS.**

Rule XLIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“6. No Member, with the intent to influence solely on the basis of partisan political affiliation an employment decision or employment practice of any private entity, shall—

“(a) take or withhold, or offer or threaten to take or withhold, an official act; or

“(b) influence, or offer or threaten to influence the official act of another.”.

**SEC. 535. NOTIFICATION OF POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—After a Senator or an elected officer of the Senate leaves office or after the termination of employment with the Senate of an employee of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate shall notify the Member, officer, or employee of the beginning and ending date of the prohibitions that apply to the Member, officer, or employee under rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

**Subtitle D—Gift and Travel Reform**

**SEC. 541. BAN ON GIFTS FROM REGISTERED LOBBYISTS AND ENTITIES THAT HIRE REGISTERED LOBBYISTS.**

Paragraph 1(a)(2) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) inserting “(A)” after “(2)”;

(2) adding at the end the following:

“(B) A Member, officer, or employee may not knowingly accept a gift from a registered lobbyist, an agent of a foreign principal, or a private entity that retains or employs a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal, except as provided in subparagraphs (c) and (d).”.

**SEC. 542. NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTIONS.**

Paragraph 1(d) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) During the dates of the national party convention for the political party to which a Member belongs, a Member may not participate in an event honoring that Member, other than in his or her capacity as the party’s presidential or vice presidential nominee or presumptive nominee, if such event is directly paid for by a registered lobbyist or a private entity that retains or employs a registered lobbyist.”.

**SEC. 543. PROPER VALUATION OF TICKETS TO ENTERTAINMENT AND SPORTING EVENTS.**

Paragraph 1(c)(1) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) inserting “(A)” before “Anything”;

(2) adding at the end the following:

“(B) The market value of a ticket to an entertainment or sporting event shall be the face value of the ticket or, in the case of a ticket without a face value, the value of the ticket with the highest face value for the event, except that if a ticket holder can establish in advance of the event to the Select Committee on Ethics that the ticket at issue is equivalent to another ticket with a face value, then the market value shall be set at the face value of the equivalent ticket. In establishing equivalency, the ticket holder shall provide written and independently verifiable information related to the primary features of the ticket, including, at a minimum, the seat location, access to parking, availability of food and refreshments, and access to venue areas not open to the public. The Select Committee on Ethics may make a determination of equivalency only if such information is provided in advance of the event.”.

**SEC. 544. RESTRICTIONS ON REGISTERED LOBBYIST PARTICIPATION IN TRAVEL AND DISCLOSURE.**

(a) PROHIBITION.—Paragraph 2 of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (a)(1), by—

(A) adding after “foreign principal” the following: “or a private entity that retains or employs 1 or more registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal”;

(B) striking the dash and inserting “complies with the requirements of this paragraph.”; and

(C) striking clauses (A) and (B);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (a)(2) as subparagraph (a)(3) and adding after subparagraph (a)(1) the following:

“(2)(A) Notwithstanding clause (1), a reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate from an individual, other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal, that is a private entity that retains or employs 1 or more registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal shall be deemed to be a reimbursement to the Senate under clause (1) if—

“(i) the reimbursement is for necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip, or similar event described in clause (1) in connection with the duties of the Member, officer, or employee and the reimbursement is provided only for attendance at or participation for 1-day (exclusive of travel time and an overnight stay) at an event described in clause (1); or

“(ii) the reimbursement is for necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip, or similar event described in clause (1) in connection with the duties of the Member, officer, or employee and the reimbursement is from an organization designated under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(B) When deciding whether to preapprove a trip under this clause, the Select Committee on Ethics shall make a determination consistent with regulations issued pursuant to section 544(b) of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007. The committee through regulations to implement subclause (A)(i) may permit a longer stay when determined by the committee to be practically required to participate in the event, but in no event may the stay exceed 2 nights.”;

(3) in subparagraph (a)(3), as redesignated, by striking “clause (1)” and inserting “clauses (1) and (2)”;

(4) in subparagraph (b), by inserting before “Each” the following: “Before an employee may accept reimbursement pursuant to subparagraph (a), the employee shall receive advance written authorization from the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works.”;

(5) in subparagraph (c)—

(A) by inserting before “Each” the following: “Each Member, officer, or employee that receives reimbursement under this paragraph shall disclose the expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed, the authorization under subparagraph (b) (for an employee), and a copy of the certification in subparagraph (e)(1) to the Secretary of the Senate not later than 30 days after the travel is completed.”;

(B) by striking “subparagraph (a)(1)” and inserting “this subparagraph”;

(C) in clause (5), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(D) by redesignating clause (6) as clause (7); and

(E) by inserting after clause (5) the following:

“(6) a description of meetings and events attended; and”;

(6) by redesignating subparagraphs (d) and (e) as subparagraphs (f) and (g), respectively;

(7) by adding after subparagraph (c) the following:

“(d)(1) A Member, officer, or employee of the Senate may not accept a reimbursement (including payment in kind) for transportation, lodging, or related expenses under subparagraph (a) for a trip that was—

“(A) planned, organized, or arranged by or at the request of a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal; or

“(B)(i) for trips described under subparagraph (a)(2)(A)(i) on which a registered lobbyist accompanies the Member, officer, or employee on any segment of the trip; or

“(ii) for all other trips allowed under this paragraph, on which a registered lobbyist accompanies the Member, officer, or employee at any point throughout the trip.

“(2) The Select Committee on Ethics shall issue regulations identifying de minimis activities by registered lobbyists or foreign agents that would not violate this subparagraph.

“(e) A Member, officer, or employee shall, before accepting travel otherwise permissible under this paragraph from any source—

“(1) provide to the Select Committee on Ethics a written certification from such source that—

“(A) the trip will not be financed in any part by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal;

“(B) the source either—

“(i) does not retain or employ registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal and is not itself a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal; or

“(ii) certifies that the trip meets the requirements of subclause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (a)(2)(A);

“(C) the source will not accept from a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal or a private entity that retains or employs 1 or more registered lobbyists or agents of a foreign principal, funds earmarked directly or indirectly for the purpose of financing the specific trip; and

“(D) the trip will not in any part be planned, organized, requested, or arranged by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal and the traveler will not be accompanied on the trip consistent with the applicable requirements of subparagraph (d)(1)(B) by a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal, except as permitted by regulations issued under subparagraph (d)(2); and

“(2) after the Select Committee on Ethics has promulgated regulations pursuant to section 544(b) of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, obtain the prior approval of the committee for such reimbursement.”; and

(8) by striking subparagraph (g), as redesignated, and inserting the following:

“(g) The Secretary of the Senate shall make all advance authorizations, certifications, and disclosures filed pursuant to this paragraph available for public inspection as soon as possible after they are received, but in no event prior to the completion of the relevant travel.”.

(b) GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (4) and not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and at annual intervals thereafter, the Select Committee on Ethics shall develop and revise, as necessary—

(A) guidelines, for purposes of implementing the amendments made by subsection (a), on evaluating a trip proposal and judging the reasonableness of an expense or expenditure, including guidelines related to evaluating—

(i) the stated mission of the organization sponsoring the trip;

(ii) the organization's prior history of sponsoring congressional trips, if any;

(iii) other educational activities performed by the organization besides sponsoring congressional trips;

(iv) whether any trips previously sponsored by the organization led to an investigation by the Select Committee on Ethics;

(v) whether the length of the trip and the itinerary is consistent with the official purpose of the trip;

(vi) whether there is an adequate connection between a trip and official duties;

(vii) the reasonableness of an amount spent by a sponsor of the trip;

(viii) whether there is a direct and immediate relationship between a source of funding and an event; and

(ix) any other factor deemed relevant by the Select Committee on Ethics; and

(B) regulations describing the information it will require individuals subject to the requirements of the amendments made by subsection (a) to submit to the committee in order to obtain the prior approval of the

committee for travel under paragraph 2 of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including any required certifications.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In developing and revising guidelines under paragraph (1)(A), the committee shall take into account the maximum per diem rates for official Federal Government travel published annually by the General Services Administration, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense.

(3) UNREASONABLE EXPENSE.—For purposes of this subsection, travel on a flight described in paragraph 1(c)(1)(C)(ii) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall not be considered to be a reasonable expense.

(4) EXTENSION.—The deadline for the initial guidelines required by paragraph (1) may be extended for 30 days by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT FOR NONCOMMERCIAL AIR TRAVEL.—

(1) CHARTER RATES.—Paragraph 1(c)(1) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) Fair market value for a flight on an aircraft described in item (ii) shall be the pro rata share of the fair market value of the normal and usual charter fare or rental charge for a comparable plane of comparable size, as determined by dividing such cost by the number of Members, officers, or employees of Congress on the flight.

“(ii) A flight on an aircraft described in this item is any flight on an aircraft that is not—

“(I) operated or paid for by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by the Federal Aviation Administration and required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules; or

“(II) in the case of travel which is abroad, an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by an appropriate foreign civil aviation authority and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules.

“(iii) This subclause shall not apply to an aircraft owned or leased by a governmental entity or by a Member of Congress or a Member's immediate family member (including an aircraft owned by an entity that is not a public corporation in which the Member or Member's immediate family member has an ownership interest), provided that the Member does not use the aircraft anymore than the Member's or immediate family member's proportionate share of ownership allows.”.

(2) UNOFFICIAL OFFICE ACCOUNTS.—Paragraph 1 of rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) For purposes of reimbursement under this rule, fair market value of a flight on an aircraft shall be determined as provided in paragraph 1(c)(1)(C) of rule XXXV.”.

(d) REVIEW OF TRAVEL ALLOWANCES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in consultation with the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, shall consider and propose, as necessary in the discretion of the subcommittee, any adjustment to the Senator's Official Personnel and Office Expense Account needed in light of the enactment of this section, and any modifications of Federal statutes or appropriations measures needed to accomplish such adjustments.

(e) SEPARATELY REGULATED EXPENSES.—Nothing in this section or section 541 is meant to alter treatment under law or Senate rules of expenses that are governed by the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act or the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act or the date the Select Committee on Ethics issues new guidelines as required by subsection (b), whichever is later. Subsection (c) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 545. FREE ATTENDANCE AT A CONSTITUENT EVENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph 1(c) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(24) Subject to the restrictions in subparagraph (a)(2)(A), free attendance at a constituent event permitted pursuant to subparagraph (g).”.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph 1 of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g)(1) A Member, officer, or employee may accept an offer of free attendance in the Member's home State at a conference, symposium, forum, panel discussion, dinner event, site visit, viewing, reception, or similar event, provided by a sponsor of the event, if—

“(A) the cost of meals provided the Member, officer, or employee is less than \$50;

“(B)(i) the event is sponsored by constituents of, or a group that consists primarily of constituents of, the Member (or the Member by whom the officer or employee is employed); and

“(ii) the event will be attended primarily by a group of at least 5 constituents of the Member (or the Member by whom the officer or employee is employed) provided that a registered lobbyist shall not attend the event; and

“(C)(i) the Member, officer, or employee participates in the event as a speaker or a panel participant, by presenting information related to Congress or matters before Congress, or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the Member's, officer's, or employee's official position; or

“(ii) attendance at the event is appropriate to the performance of the official duties or representative function of the Member, officer, or employee.

“(2) A Member, officer, or employee who attends an event described in clause (1) may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at the event for an accompanying individual if others in attendance will generally be similarly accompanied or if such attendance is appropriate to assist in the representation of the Senate.

“(3) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘free attendance’ has the same meaning given such term in subparagraph (d).”.

#### SEC. 546. SENATE PRIVATELY PAID TRAVEL PUBLIC WEBSITE.

(a) TRAVEL DISCLOSURE.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Secretary of the Senate shall establish a publicly available website without fee or without access charge, that contains information on travel that is subject to disclosure under paragraph 2 of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that includes, with respect to travel occurring on or after January 1, 2008—

(1) a search engine;

(2) uniform categorization by Member, dates of travel, and any other common categories associated with congressional travel; and

(3) forms filed in the Senate relating to officially related travel.

(b) RETENTION.—The Secretary of the Senate shall maintain the information posted on the public Internet site of the Office of the Secretary under this section for a period not longer than 4 years after receiving the information.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary of the Senate is unable to meet the

deadline established under subsection (a), the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may grant an extension of the Secretary of the Senate.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

#### Subtitle E—Other Reforms

#### SEC. 551. COMPLIANCE WITH LOBBYING DISCLOSURE.

Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs 10 through 13 as paragraphs 11 through 14, respectively; and

(2) inserting after paragraph 9, the following:

“10. Paragraphs 8 and 9 shall not apply to contacts with the staff of the Secretary of the Senate regarding compliance with the lobbying disclosure requirements of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.”.

#### SEC. 552. PROHIBIT OFFICIAL CONTACT WITH SPOUSE OR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER OF MEMBER WHO IS A REGISTERED LOBBYIST.

Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs 11 through 14 as paragraphs 12 through 15, respectively; and

(2) inserting after paragraph 10, the following:

“11. (a) If a Member's spouse or immediate family member is a registered lobbyist, or is employed or retained by such a registered lobbyist or an entity that hires or retains a registered lobbyist for the purpose of influencing legislation, the Member shall prohibit all staff employed or supervised by that Member (including staff in personal, committee, and leadership offices) from having any contact with the Member's spouse or immediate family member that constitutes a lobbying contact as defined by section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 by such person.

“(b) Members and employees on the staff of a Member (including staff in personal, committee, and leadership offices) shall be prohibited from having any contact that constitutes a lobbying contact as defined by section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 by any spouse of a Member who is a registered lobbyist, or is employed or retained by such a registered lobbyist.

“(c) The prohibition in subparagraph (b) shall not apply to the spouse of a Member who was serving as a registered lobbyist at least 1 year prior to the most recent election of that Member to office or at least 1 year prior to his or her marriage to that Member.”.

#### SEC. 553. MANDATORY SENATE ETHICS TRAINING FOR MEMBERS AND STAFF.

(a) **TRAINING PROGRAM.**—The Select Committee on Ethics shall conduct ongoing ethics training and awareness programs for Members of the Senate and Senate staff.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The ethics training program conducted by the Select Committee on Ethics shall be completed by—

(1) new Senators or staff not later than 60 days after commencing service or employment; and

(2) Senators and Senate staff serving or employed on the date of enactment of this Act not later than 165 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 554. ANNUAL REPORT BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.

The Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate shall issue an annual report due no later than January 31, describing the following:

(1) The number of alleged violations of Senate rules received from any source, in-

cluding the number raised by a Senator or staff of the committee.

(2) A list of the number of alleged violations that were dismissed—

(A) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction or, in which, even if the allegations in the complaint are true, no violation of Senate rules would exist; or

(B) because they failed to provide sufficient facts as to any material violation of the Senate rules beyond mere allegation or assertion.

(3) The number of alleged violations in which the committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry.

(4) The number of alleged violations that resulted in an adjudicatory review.

(5) The number of alleged violations that the committee dismissed for lack of substantial merit.

(6) The number of private letters of admonition or public letters of admonition issued.

(7) The number of matters resulting in a disciplinary sanction.

(8) Any other information deemed by the committee to be appropriate to describe its activities in the preceding year.

#### SEC. 555. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The Senate adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

#### SEC. 555. EFFECTIVE DATE AND GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this title, this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this title.

#### TITLE VI—PROHIBITED USE OF PRIVATE AIRCRAFT

#### SEC. 601. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR FLIGHTS ON NONCOMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT.

(a) **RESTRICTIONS.**—Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 439a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR FLIGHTS ON NONCOMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a candidate for election for Federal office (other than a candidate who is subject to paragraph (2)), or any authorized committee of such a candidate, may not make any expenditure for a flight on an aircraft unless—

“(A) the aircraft is operated by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by the Federal Aviation Administration and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules, or, in the case of travel which is abroad, by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by an appropriate foreign civil aviation authority and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules; or

“(B) the candidate, the authorized committee, or other political committee pays to the owner, lessee, or other person who provides the airplane the pro rata share of the fair market value of such flight (as determined by dividing the fair market value of the normal and usual charter fare or rental charge for a comparable plane of comparable size by the number of candidates on the flight) within a commercially reasonable time frame after the date on which the flight is taken.

“(2) **HOUSE CANDIDATES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in the case of a candidate for election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident

Commissioner to, the Congress, an authorized committee and a leadership PAC of the candidate may not make any expenditure for a flight on an aircraft unless—

“(A) the aircraft is operated by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by the Federal Aviation Administration and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules, or, in the case of travel which is abroad, by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by an appropriate foreign civil aviation authority and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules; or

“(B) the aircraft is operated by an entity of the Federal government or the government of any State.

“(3) **EXCEPTION FOR AIRCRAFT OWNED OR LEASED BY CANDIDATE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraphs (1) and (2) do not apply to a flight on an aircraft owned or leased by the candidate involved or an immediate family member of the candidate (including an aircraft owned by an entity that is not a public corporation in which the candidate or an immediate family member of the candidate has an ownership interest), so long as the candidate does not use the aircraft more than the candidate's or immediate family member's proportionate share of ownership allows.

“(B) **IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.**—In this subparagraph (A), the term ‘immediate family member’ means, with respect to a candidate, a father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, husband, wife, father-in-law, or mother-in-law.

“(4) **LEADERSHIP PAC DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘leadership PAC’ has the meaning given such term in section 304(i)(8)(B).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to flights taken on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

#### SEC. 701. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT ANY APPLICABLE RESTRICTIONS ON CONGRESSIONAL OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES SHOULD APPLY TO THE EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

It is the sense of the Congress that any applicable restrictions on congressional officials and employees in this Act should apply to the executive and judicial branches.

#### SEC. 702. KNOWING AND WILLFUL FALSIFICATION OR FAILURE TO REPORT.

Section 104(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$50,000”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly and willfully—

“(i) falsify any information that such person is required to report under section 102; and

“(ii) fail to file or report any information that such person is required to report under section 102.

“(B) Any person who—

“(i) violates subparagraph (A)(i) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both; and

“(ii) violates subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code.”.

#### SEC. 703. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to prohibit any expressive conduct protected from legal prohibition by, or any activities protected by the free speech, free exercise, or free association clauses of, the First Amendment to the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, if there is one message that was abundantly clear based on the results of last year's election results, it was that the American people want us to end the culture of corruption that has enveloped the legislative process.

For far too long, Americans have seen business as usual where time and time again special interests trump the public interest.

□ 1045

So we've heard that message loud and clear. For the past several months, the House and the Senate have diligently worked together to fuse a legislative response that combines the best of the measures passed by both Houses earlier this year.

The measure that we consider today will go a long way toward bringing back accountability to the Congress and to restoring the trust of the American people in their government. S. 1 accomplishes these critical goals in four ways.

First, S. 1 puts an end to the K Street Project, an insidious effort that employed threats and intimidation to control the legislative process. S. 1 ensures that such efforts will no longer be permitted. It specifically prohibits Members and senior staff from influencing hiring decisions or practices of private entities for partisan political gain.

Second, S. 1 shines a disinfecting spotlight on lobbying activities by mandating full and enhanced public disclosure on these activities. Pursuant to this measure, lobbyists will have to file reports on their lobbying activities twice as often each year. They will be required to disclose their contacts with Congress. They must certify that they did not give a gift or pay for travel in violation of the rules and, for the first time, file these reports electronically in a public, searchable database so that anyone can review them.

Third, S. 1 closes loopholes in the current law that have been exploited to avoid the clear intent of the Lobbying Disclosure Act. It does this by mandating the disclosure of contributions in excess of \$5,000 by businesses or organizations that actively lobby through certain coalitions and associa-

tions. And, it also requires the disclosure of the past executive and congressional employment of registered lobbyists.

Importantly, S. 1 prohibits a Member's spouse who becomes a lobbyist after the Member's election from making direct lobbying contacts to the Member or the Member's office.

In addition, the bill addresses the process by which political contributions are bundled by campaign committees. It requires each committee to disclose to the Federal Election Commission, on a semiannual basis, specified information for each currently registered lobbyist who has either forwarded or been credited for raising contributions totaling at least \$15,000 during the reporting period.

Fourth, and perhaps most significantly, S. 1 puts real teeth into enforcement. It increases the penalties for violations of the Lobbying Disclosure Act to deter and punish corrupt activity. It substantially increases civil penalties from the current level of \$50,000, to four times as much, to \$200,000 and provides for the imposition of criminal penalties of up to 5 years for knowing and corrupt violations of the Act.

These are some of the major reforms that S. 1 offers. This bill recognizes the importance of lobbying to responsive and effective congressional and executive decision-making. And these reforms will help strengthen the sound foundation of the Lobbying Disclosure Act and go a long way toward restoring the trust of the American people in our system of government.

I want to respectfully point out the contributions from the other side, particularly the ranking member of Judiciary, LAMAR SMITH, in this endeavor, and so I urge my colleagues all to join me in supporting the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all deplore unethical conduct by Members of Congress and their staff. Each party has their fair share of examples. The public wants and deserves honest government. Unfortunately, this legislation does not bode well for this Congress' ability to deliver it.

In May, this House brought up a base bill that seemed very familiar to Republicans because the increased disclosures required in the bill were largely those contained in H.R. 4975, which was introduced by Congressman DAVID DREIER, and which passed the House in the last Congress.

Last year's H.R. 4975 contained all of the following provisions: a requirement for Members to disclose post-employment negotiations with private entities; a prohibition on partisan influences on an outside entity's employment decisions; and increased quarterly electronic filing in a public data-

base of lobbyist campaign contributions linked to Federal Election Commission filings.

That Republican legislation also increased civil and criminal penalties for failures to comply; required disclosure by lobbyists of all past executive branch and congressional employment; and contained a prohibition on lobbyists' violation of House gift ban rules.

Legislation the Democrats introduced this Congress, in the form of H.R. 2316, largely replicated Republican efforts from the previous Congress.

At the Judiciary Committee's markup of H.R. 2316, several additional Republican amendments that would strengthen this bill were adopted by voice vote. One provided for a 1-year revolving door ban that would prohibit private lawyers and law firms who enter into contracts with congressional committees from lobbying Congress while under contract to such committee and for 1 year thereafter.

That amendment by Representative CHRIS CANNON was adopted by voice vote at the committee, and was passed out of the House of Representatives. But it is nowhere to be found in the bill before us today.

Also, in May, Democrats supported and passed two motions to recommit offered by Republicans that contained even more ethics reforms. Those reforms required lobbyists to disclose which special projects they lobbied for.

If a special interest lobbyist is having closed-door meetings with Members of Congress regarding programs that do not benefit all Americans but only benefit a small group of people in one part of the country, then those projects should be disclosed.

The Republican motion to recommit also closed the existing loophole that allows State and local government entities to give gifts and travel to Members and their staff that other entities cannot give. It makes little sense to exempt entities that operate on taxpayer dollars from the gift and travel ban.

Current rules allow taxpayer-funded entities to give gifts and travel to Members and staff while they try to convince those same Members and staff to send more Federal taxpayer dollars their way. That is not fair, and the Republican motion to recommit, which was adopted, would have ended that practice.

The Republicans' motion to recommit also contained a reverse revolving door provision that would have prohibited a congressional employee who was a registered lobbyist prior to their congressional employment from engaging in official business with their former private employer for a period of 1 year.

The Republicans' motion to recommit also included the Republican-amended text to H.R. 2317, which required that bundled contributions to political action committees, often referred to as PACs, be fully disclosed.

Viewed in the harsh light of recent history, the legislation we consider

today is a hollow shell of reform. Just listen to the following list of reforms that Democrats have abandoned.

The provisions in this bill requiring the disclosure of contributions bundled together by lobbyists is weaker than the reforms passed in May, as this legislation requires the disclosure of bundled contributions exceeding \$15,000 rather than the original \$5,000.

That means less disclosure and less accountability to the American people. The weakened bundling disclosure provisions in this bill do not even cover bundled disclosures to PACs, a reform that 33 Democrats supported when it was accepted as part of the Republicans' motion to recommit H.R. 2317, and that 158 Democrats supported when it was accepted as part of the Republicans' motion to recommit H.R. 2316.

The newspaper Roll Call reported yesterday that, "The average Democratic incumbent raised over 63 percent more from PACs during the first half of this year than during the same period in 2005." Could that be why Democrats don't want to disclose the bundled contributions lobbyists give to PACs?

This bill also fails to contain the following reforms that 158 Democrats supported in May. The length of this list defines the credibility chasm that now separates the Democratic Party from American voters.

The provision requiring the disclosure of bundled contributions by political action committees? Gone.

The provision requiring lobbyists to disclose the special projects they lobby for? Gone.

The provision prohibiting State and local governments from giving expensive gifts and lavish travel to Members of Congress in return for taxpayer dollars? Gone.

The provision prohibiting congressional employees who were lobbyists from engaging in official business with their former lobbyist employers? Gone.

Last May, the Washington Post reported that the Democrats brought up their original legislation "after scrapping most key elements of an ethics package meant to deliver on Democratic promises to bring unprecedented accountability to Congress."

Today, essential reforms have been thrown overboard, and the Democratic pledge of reform is sinking fast.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague for his examination of the bill. We've worked on this bill together. I think we're in support of it, and I hope to enjoy the gentleman's continued success and cooperation in the matter.

It's very important that we understand that we are ending the pay-to-play K Street Project which, under this bill before us, now prohibits Members and their staff from influencing hiring decisions of private organizations on the sole basis of partisan political gain.

It subjects those who violate this provision to a fine and imprisonment of up to 15 years.

We prohibit lobbyists from providing gifts or travel to Members of Congress who have knowledge that the gift or travel is in violation of the Senate or the House rules.

We require now lobbyist disclosure filings to be filed twice as often by decreasing the time from filing from semiannually to quarterly.

We require lobbyist disclosures in both the Senate and the House to be filed electronically and creates a public and searchable Internet database of such information.

We increase civil penalties for knowing and willful violations of the Lobby Disclosure Act. We increase them by four times as much, from \$50,000 to \$200,000, and imposes a criminal penalty up to 5 years for knowing and corrupt failure to comply with the Act.

We require the GAO to audit annually lobbyists' compliance with these disclosure rules and, further, require lobbyists to certify that they've not been given gifts or travel that would violate either Senate or House rules.

We require the disclosure of businesses or organizations that contribute in excess of \$5,000 and actively participate in lobbying activities by certain coalitions and associations.

We're requiring disclosure to the Federal Election Commission when lobbyists bundle over \$15,000 semiannually in campaign contributions for any federally elected official, including the Senate, the House or presidential, or leadership PACs.

We require lobbyists to disclose to the Secretary of the Senate and the House Clerk their campaign contributions and payments to presidential libraries, inaugural committees or entities controlled by the name for or honoring Members of Congress.

□ 1100

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an extremely difficult and new way of controlling lobby operations. I think we are restoring the trust of the American people and our system of government, and I think we are living up to the title of this measure, honest leadership and open government.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, the current ranking member and former chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I want to say what a privilege it is for me to be, as always, on the floor with the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my good friend from Detroit (Mr. CONYERS) and, of course, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, my friend from San Antonio (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the distinguished Chair go through the litany of items that are included in this meas-

ure, I couldn't help but think it's virtually identical to what we passed in the last Congress. I know there are a number of things we came to agree upon, and so that's why I rise today in somewhat quiet resignation over this so-called Honest Leadership and Open Government Act. I am not opposed to the bill. I am not opposed to the bill because, frankly, there is nothing to be opposed to.

The bill that I sponsored that Mr. SMITH referred to in the last Congress was repeatedly referred to by our leadership colleagues on the other side of the aisle as a sham. They regularly said that the items that frankly were just outlined by Mr. CONYERS in this bill that he is describing, when I offered it, it was described as a sham.

But my colleagues, unfortunately, while we were successful during the House consideration of the bill to bring it up to the sham level from its initial sub-sham status, I would argue that this bill is not much better overall on the substance, and it is far, far worse on the process, which is a big part of the responsibilities that I have.

The new majority, as we all know, promised us open conferences, with meaningful participation by the minority party. What we have here is a willful effort to avoid a conference entirely without any participation by Republicans or public disclosure of the language.

Now, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules just last week complained to me about how the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee never told his ranking member about where and when conferences on tax bills were meeting.

Well, I have got to hand it to the new majority. They have come up with a novel answer to that problem. Don't hold conferences at all. That way, you aren't even bothered with having to file a conference report. That's right, the most open Congress in history, which is what we have continued to hear this one described as, has not made the text of its ballyhooed lobbying bill available to the public or rank-and-file members anywhere, anywhere that we could find.

As late as 8:30 this morning, we checked the Speaker's Web site, the majority leader's Web site, the Judiciary Committee's Web site, even Thomas. It was nowhere to be found.

We were able, we were able, though, to get a copy of it. Guess how? We got it from a lobbyist. When I say that there was no participation by Republicans, I mean none, none whatsoever.

As I said, I have the greatest regard for my friend from Detroit (Mr. CONYERS) who works so ably as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I appreciate his support for my amendment that I offered on floor.

However, you can imagine my surprise when I discovered late yesterday that there were changes in my amendment in the document that we have in front of us. Now, these changes aren't

bad changes. I am not going to complain about the changes that were made. They probably actually improved the amendment; that's what the legislative process is all about.

But if the majority really wanted to declare a new day and live up to the promises of inclusion, calling me, asking me my thoughts on the change might have been a step in the right direction; but apparently the majority just couldn't be bothered with that at all.

There is a great deal missing from this bill that a majority of the House, including 138 Democrats, voted for, things like a reverse revolving door, requiring a lobbyist to disclose earmarks that they are lobbying for, and an end to the State and local governments lobbying loophole.

Despite promises to the contrary, they haven't extended our earmark rules to cover authorizing and tax bills, which is one of the last things we did in this Congress. Unfortunately, we have yet to bring the new majority's level up to ours on dealing with that disclosure on authorizing and tax bills.

As the majority pushes this bill through without any input from Republicans, they are responsible for its content. They are responsible for its content, not us.

I mourn this missed opportunity for bipartisanship, which we continue to hear about on a regular basis, and, frankly, grieve the broken promises which, not just Republicans, but the American people have been subjected to.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. STENY HOYER, from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee for yielding and thank him for his extraordinary leadership in bringing this bill to the floor and would allay somewhat the grief that is felt by the former chairman of the Rules Committee, the ranking Republican.

Mr. Speaker, on the one hand he says much of this bill is that which we passed last time offered by our friends on the minority side. If that is the case, we, as I understand the premise, we have adopted much of what you have proposed. It's hard to say that you weren't consulted when we have adopted what your contention is, much of what you have proposed. So I would hope that the grief would be allayed in that respect.

Secondly, let me say this. No conference. Why no conference? Because a Republican Member of the United States Senate wouldn't let us go to conference. That's why there was no conference. He stood day after day

after day objecting to adopting this important reform package.

As a result, we couldn't go to conference. So you can't complain on the one hand we are not in conference when it is a Republican Senator from South Carolina who day after day, week after week, objected to doing just that.

Today is a proud day for this body. Again, I congratulate my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS, and a dramatic example of how the Congress that was elected last November pledging to clean up the culture of corruption is making good on its promise.

I will talk about that a little bit at the end in terms of rules are nice, but performance is better. Last January, on the first day of this new, Congress we enacted sweeping ethics changes. Today, with this Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, we have a simple, straightforward purpose, to continue to restore public confidence in the legislative process.

I commend Chairman CONYERS, as I have, for his leadership in making possible this comprehensive reform measure. By shining a bright light on the campaign contributions that registered lobbyists bundle for Members of Congress, the conference report before us increases transparency and gives the American people important insight on the legislative process.

By denying Members convicted of crimes their congressional pensions, the conference report ensures that Members who break their oath to uphold the laws of the land will not only suffer public disgrace and criminal sanction, but also lifetime financial loss.

There is no reason for taxpayers to subsidize criminal behavior of Members of Congress. Freshman Member NANCY BOYDA deserves a great deal of credit for her work on this provision. By requiring Members engaged in any job negotiations to recuse themselves from any matter in which there is a conflict of interest, the conference report before us will end the practice of Members trying to cash in on the legislation they steer through this body.

I don't know how many of you had the opportunity to watch "60 Minutes" this past Sunday and hear the comments of Mr. BURTON and Mr. JONES, but that is trying to address that critical problem.

As important as this legislation and the ethics changes made in January are, they alone will not ensure the integrity of our process and this institution. Rather, the Members of this House will ensure the integrity of this House when we conduct ourselves openly and honestly and hold accountable, through a vigorous pursuit of the enforcement of our rules by the Ethics Committee, hold accountable those who abide, do not abide by the rules in the highest ethical standards.

Thus we have an obligation to ensure that the Ethics Committee does the job

that it was constituted to perform. It did not do so in the recent Congresses. The implementation of rules, while critical, must be followed by effective real enforcement.

This conference report is an important step forward, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle, including Mr. SMITH, for the work that they have done through the years to bring us to this day and close by congratulating Mr. CONYERS and the leadership of our Speaker in accomplishing this objective.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

First of all, I would like to thank the majority leader for acknowledging this bill that we considered today largely mirrors the Republican legislation on ethics from the last Congress. As I mentioned in my opening statement a few minutes ago, I went through all the provisions that, in fact, had been carried over from the Republican bill last year.

But I would correct the majority leader in one respect, and that is many of the Republican reforms that were included in our motion to recommit which passed successfully with largely Democratic support earlier, all of those Republican reforms were eliminated. So this bill would have been much improved and much better if all the Republican reforms had, in fact, been included. I regret that was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to my friend and my colleague from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise not in opposition to this bill, in fact, I plan to support the bill, and I think most of my colleagues will on both sides of the aisle, but to just say that I regret that this is an opportunity missed for the new Democratic majority.

If it's all about wanting to have one more of the 6 for '06 to take home during the August recess and say, well, now, we have passed three of the six, I would say that it should only be 2.25 at the most, because, as my colleagues have pointed out, this reform is only about a fourth of what was brought to us in that first couple of weeks of the 110th as part of the 6 for '06, six promises that were made to the American people that if you elect us, the Democrats, to a new majority, this is what we will deliver for you.

And I will say again that this is a tremendous opportunity missed on behalf of the new majority. This bill just absolutely does not go far enough.

Speaking to that point, I want to point out that in the bill that we passed in the House last year, in the 109th, when Republicans enjoyed majority status, I had an amendment to this bill, which I think that we need to have as part of the bill today. It was passed by voice vote.

Yes, I regret, as the majority leader pointed out a minute ago, that the



other body did not go to conference on this good sound, solid bill that had my amendment as a part of it. But let me point out quickly what that amendment says.

Twenty years ago or more, in this Congress, a person could retire, a Member could retire and actually take what money they have in their campaign account, whether that's five figures or six figures or seven figures, could take that with them at retirement and convert that into personal gain. They could buy a Malibu beach home or a Rolls Royce car if they wanted to or send their children to the most expensive college in the Nation. Whatever they wanted to do, they could convert those campaign funds to personal use.

Well, in the wisdom of the Congress, that was ended about 20 years ago. Just before it ended, a number of Members retired, took retirement, so they didn't have to forfeit that money. That was a good change.

We have a situation now where a lot of Members form what are known as leadership PACs. Now, they don't necessarily have to be in leadership. I formed a PAC that I called DOCPAC and raised a little money for that so-called leadership PAC. But what I am talking about is the fact that the most powerful Members of the Congress, both in the House and the Senate, formed these leadership PACs. Let me give you just a couple of names, not Members, but members of the PAC.

□ 1115

Searchlight Leadership Fund PAC, in the other body, in the 2006 cycle raised \$2,346,000; spent \$300,000 of that money to support other candidates in that party, which is an appropriate use of that money. But \$2 million of it was spent for God knows what, Mr. Speaker.

Another PAC, Hill PAC raised \$2,900,000.

Keeping America's Promises, \$7,750,000 raised in the 2006 election cycle.

VOL-PAC, \$8 million raised in the 2006 election cycle.

There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, in the rules that says that money cannot be converted to personal use when these Members, some of whom have recently, retired or are going to retire in the near future.

So I would think that Members on both sides of the aisle would want to support something like this, to say that once a Member leaves this body that PAC money cannot be converted to personal use.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say once again, I have great respect for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I am not opposed to the bill, and I know we have worked hard and I plan to support it. I am just saying the opportunity was missed. We should have gone much further. I hope sometime in the near future we will solve some of these problems like this leadership PAC issue.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues on the other side, the gentleman from Georgia, and of course the ranking member, for pointing out additional refinements that we must continue to concern ourselves with. The Lobbying and Ethics Reform bill is not over with today's work. Our job continues, and I will be looking forward for these constructive comments that they will be bringing to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD a letter from the Campaign Legal Center and others that support this legislation, and I would like you to know that the organizations' authors that signed this are among the most watchful and effective critics of the subject of ethics and lobbying that we have in the country.

The letter was signed by the U.S. PIRG, the Public Citizen, the League of Women Voters, Democracy 21, Common Cause, the Campaign Legal Center, all who have said that:

Our organizations strongly urge you to vote for the lobbying and ethics reform legislation when it is considered by the House on the Suspension Calendar.

The legislation being presented to the House constitutes landmark reform of the Nation's lobbying disclosure laws and landmark reform of the Senate ethics rules. It is designed to help address the worst congressional corruption scandals in 30 years that were revealed during the last Congress.

Under the legislation, for the first time citizens will be provided with a wealth of information about the multiple ways in which lobbyists and lobbyist organizations provide financial support to assist Members. For the first time, candidate campaign committees, leadership PACs, and political party committees will be required to disclose the bundled contributions raised for them by lobbyists and lobbying organizations. The legislation also includes fundamental reforms of the Senate ethics rules very similar to the landmark House ethics reforms adopted at the beginning of the year.

JULY 30, 2007.

Re Vote for the lobbying and ethics reform bill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Our organizations strongly urge you to vote for the lobbying and ethics reform legislation when it is considered by the House on the suspension calendar.

The organizations include the Campaign Legal Center, Common Cause, Democracy 21, the League of Women Voters, Public Citizen and U.S. PIRG.

The legislation being presented to the House constitutes landmark reform of the nation's lobbying disclosure laws and landmark reform of the Senate ethics rules. It is designed to help address the worst congressional corruption scandals in 30 years that were revealed during the last Congress.

Under the legislation, for the first time citizens will be provided with a wealth of information about the multiple ways in which lobbyists and lobbying organizations provide financial support to assist Members. For the

first time, candidate campaign committees, leadership PACs and political party committees will be required to disclose the "bundled" contributions raised for them by lobbyists and lobbying organizations.

The legislation also includes fundamental reforms of the Senate ethics rules very similar to the landmark House ethics reforms adopted at the beginning of the year.

The process being used in the House to vote on this legislation is the result of a Republican Senator, Jim DeMint (R-SC), blocking the House and Senate from going to conference on the lobbying and ethics reforms and bringing a conference report to the House and Senate floors for an up-or-down vote. There is absolutely no basis for a House member to vote against this legislation on process or substance grounds.

A vote against this legislation is a vote against landmark lobbying and ethics reforms.

Our organizations strongly urge you to vote for the lobbying and ethics legislation when it comes to the House floor for a vote.

Campaign Legal Center.  
Common Cause.  
Democracy 21.  
League of Women Voters.  
Public Citizen.  
U.S. PIRG.

And, ladies and gentlemen of the House, these organizations and their representatives followed the work of the House and the Judiciary Committee very carefully, and frequently made important recommendations which we were pleased to incorporate in the final legislation that is before the House today. They have done an excellent job in helping us bring lobbying and ethics before the House, and I have no doubt that they will continue to monitor our success in the measure today, and what needs to be done.

This is not closing down a chapter on a subject matter. Indeed, it will be a continuing responsibility of the Committee on the Judiciary to make sure that what we have put into law is not only effective and works but that it is enforced as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how much time remains for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to my friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman.

I would say, to correct the record, this bill does include violations of 18 U.S.C. 219, acting as a foreign principal.

There are several reforms in this measure, but what is most surprising are the reforms which are not in this measure, reforms which both Speaker PELOSI and Speaker HASTERT supported.

Under this legislation, a Member of Congress convicted of income tax evasion would still have a full right to his Federal pension. Under this legislation, a Member of Congress convicted of

interstate and foreign travel or transportation in the aid of racketeering enterprises is fully able to have a pension. In fact, there are other felonies, all of which we included in previous reform measures which are were dropped from this reform measure.

A Member can get a full Federal pension if they commit fraud by wire, radio, or television.

A Member can get a full pension if they are caught and convicted of influencing or injuring an officer or juror.

A Member can get a full pension for intimidation to secure political contributions, or for the promise of appointment of a candidate.

Under this legislation, a Member can get a full taxpayer pension if they make expenditures to influence voting.

In fact, previous reform legislation which Speakers PELOSI and HASTERT both supported included 21 separate felonies which would kill the pension for a Member of Congress convicted of a felony. But this legislation only includes four. It only includes four.

Now, the way that this happened is instructive. There was no amendment to this legislation allowed in the House of Representatives, because an amendment adding all of these felonies would have carried the day, as it carried in the past. Of course, there was no conference on this bill either.

So, a very limited set of reforms, including only four felonies, has gone forward, and the longer list of 21 separate public integrity felonies listed by the Department of Justice has not been included as it was in previous reform measures.

I would simply say to the House that a Member of Congress convicted of income tax evasion should not get a taxpayer-funded pension. But that reform was left out.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise only to advise my colleague that starting at page 51 on our bill, we have so many felonies that are listed that they run for three pages. And I don't have the time to go through them today, but some of them are the ones that the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. KIRK. The gentleman is the author of amendment; if he will yield. If a Member is convicted of income tax evasion under this legislation, is the pension canceled?

Mr. CONYERS. I don't see it here.

Mr. KIRK. I would simply suggest to the House, the author should know the answer to this question.

Mr. CONYERS. The answer is, it is not included in here.

Mr. KIRK. As are 17 other felonies.

Mr. CONYERS. But every other one is. So I just wanted to refer the distinguished gentleman to the numbers of pages of felonies that are included in here, and I thank him for the one that concerns him mostly.

I am going to conclude my remarks by thanking all of my colleagues who have put time in on this matter. I want

to thank the ranking member and the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

We have a major accomplishment on our hands. What we need to do is to continue to follow through on implementing and improving anything in this measure that anybody would like to bring to our attention. But what we are doing is finally ending the cynical business as usual environment where big business and special interests dominate the legislative process to the detriment of the public interests. That is what all of these months and continuing wrangling and what our good government groups have been looking at and criticizing us for far too frequently is now being corrected.

This is a measure that every Member in the Congress can be proud of and support fully. A vote for this measure is a vote to end the culture of corruption. The time for S. 1 is now, and I accordingly urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and commend the leadership as well as my colleagues involved in negotiating this landmark agreement.

Referring to the House of Representatives, Alexander Hamilton once said, "Here, sir, the people govern." Today, that quotation no longer rings hollow.

The people are once again in charge of the people's House with this legislation. We followed through with our campaign promise by restoring integrity, transparency, and accountability in the way we do the people's business.

Members of Congress, lobbyists, and special interests will share the responsibility to disclose information that sheds light on how the influence of money in politics shapes the outcome of legislation.

In particular, I am proud to support transparency in reporting "bundled" campaign contributions, as championed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), of whose legislation I am an original cosponsor.

This agreement will help avert corruption and back-room dealmaking that undermines this institution and the faith our constituents have in the way we do business.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1, the Honest Leadership, Open Government Act of 2007. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of it to clean up the culture of corruption in Washington.

The first order of business in the 110th Congress has been to restore honesty and integrity to the U.S. House of Representatives. On the first day of the new Congress, we imposed tough new rules on Members of Congress to ban gifts from lobbyists, end the abuses connected to lobbyist-funded congressional travel, require full transparency and end the abuse of special interest earmarks, to ensure this Congress upholds the highest ethical standards.

S. 1 will now bring unprecedented transparency and accountability to lobbyists' activities. For the first time, lobbyists who collect campaign checks for Members of Congress must report this practice. Members of Congress will also be required to disclose if more than \$15,000 in campaign contributions was collected on his or her behalf by a lobbyist.

Lobbyists will be required to disclose contributions to Members' charities, events honoring Members, contributions intended to pay the cost of a meeting and contributions to Presidential Library Funds.

Lobbyists will now be required to file disclosure reports quarterly rather than semi-annually. The bill will establish an online, searchable public database of these lobbyist disclosure reports. In addition, this legislation increases criminal and civil penalties for violating the Lobby Disclose Act to \$200,000 and five years in prison.

We have added additional restrictions on Members of Congress by requiring sitting Members to disclose job negotiations for post-Congressional employment and to recuse themselves if there is a conflict of interest. We will also establish an online, searchable public database of Members' travel and personal financial disclosure forms.

The ongoing corruption scandals in the U.S. House and Senate anger me because they threaten the bonds between the American people and their elected leaders. Therefore, I am very pleased that this bill denies pension benefits to those Members of Congress convicted of corruption while serving the American people. I have always believed that public office is a public trust, and I work every day to live up to the trust the people of North Carolina's Second Congressional District have placed in me.

I urge my colleagues to vote for a new direction and to support honest leadership and an open government.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 1, the Honest Leadership, Open Government Act.

As the scandals of the past few years have made clear, it is time to change the way that business is conducted in Washington. The legislation before us today will implement several necessary reforms including new transparency for lobbyists who bundle campaign contributions, ending the K Street Project, expanding public disclosure of Members' travel and finances, and closing the revolving door between the legislative branch and post-employment lobbying.

S. 1 is supported by Common Cause, Democracy 21, Public Citizen, League of Women Voters, U.S. PIRG, and Campaign Legal Center.

I hope that this bill will help to restore the American people's confidence in their government. I want to commend Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic Leadership for their commitment to getting this legislation through Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act.

As a freshman Member of this body, I believe it is critical that we restore the people's faith in the People's House.

This bill will bring transparency to lobbyists' activities and the relationship between Members of Congress and those who seek to influence us.

It is one in a series of steps we must take to change the status quo in Washington.

Greater transparency, a willingness to change the way we do business, and adequate oversight are all essential elements of the reforms we have a responsibility to enact.

The priorities of Iowa's Second District are my priorities as a Member of Congress. This bill is a step toward assuring my constituents, and all American citizens, that the House of Representatives remains in their hands.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, as I have proudly supported each of this Democratic majority's initiatives to strengthen lobbying and ethics reform in Washington.

In the current political climate it is increasingly clear that Congress must serve as an example for the Federal Government. With this bill's passage, Americans can be confident that their representatives in Congress will be held to an ever-higher standard of conduct.

This bill closes the most abused loopholes by banning lobbyist-funded gifts and travel, reforming congressional earmarks, and by prohibiting Members from influencing outside hiring decisions for partisan gain. It also addresses the larger issues of reform by requiring public disclosure of bundled campaign contributions and lobbyist activity. And if that isn't enough, this bill also increases the punishment for Members and lobbyists who break the law.

It's clear this bill raises the bar for congressional conduct. I look forward to its passage and to the creation of a more open government.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.1, the Honest Leadership, Open Government Act of 2007. S.1 contains the contents of an agreement between the House and the Senate in the reconciliation of provisions between the respective bills of these institutions to impose the highest standards of ethics reform on the House and the Senate and to restrict the influence of special interests and lobbyists. The American people spoke loud and clear in their demand for change on Capitol Hill. They conveyed a very strong message that an environment that accommodated Duke Cunningham and Jack Abramoff was unacceptable and that the culture of corruption must stop. As a result I urge the House to adopt this measure. This Conference agreement between the House and Senate contains some of the following provisions:

Bans lavish convention parties—prohibits Members of Congress from attending national political convention parties held in their honor and paid for by lobbyists or their clients.

Creates new transparency for lobbyist political campaign fund activity and other financial contributions—requires disclosure when lobbyists bundle campaign contributions for any federal elected official, candidate or leadership PAC; and requires lobbyists to detail their own campaign contributions, and payments to Presidential libraries, Inaugural Committees or entities controlled by or named for Members of Congress.

Ends K-Street Project—Prohibits Members of Congress and their staff from attempting to influence employment decisions in exchange for political access.

Imposes restrictions on corporate flights—requires Senators, Senate candidates and Presidential candidates to pay charter rates for trips on private planes; bars House candidates from accepting trips on private planes.

Expands public disclosure of lobbyist activities—requires lobbyists to file reports on their lobbying twice as often each year, and for the first time to file them electronically in a public,

searchable database; and increases civil and criminal penalties for knowingly violating lobbying disclosure rules.

Creates Congressional Pension Accountability—Denies Congressional retirement benefits to Members of Congress who are convicted of bribery, perjury and other similar crimes.

#### BUNDLING CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

This bill also contains a provision that creates greater transparency at the intersection of campaign contributions and public policy. While existing campaign finance laws place limits on campaign contribution amounts, individuals that want to exceed the limits may do so by pulling together the contributions of third parties. This practice is known as "bundling". In and of itself, there is nothing wrong with this practice of aggregating the contributions of others. However, when the bundling of contributions is done by someone who lobbies on behalf of a particular interest, this practice enables the lobbyist to enhance his or her stature with an official. This enhancement increases their opportunity to advance the cause of a special interest.

In order to guard against the use of this practice to exert an undue influence over public policy, I believe that we need to inject transparency into this process. Last year I introduced a bill to require that lobbyists disclose their bundling of campaign contributions on lobbying disclosure forms that are required under existing law in accordance with the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. While this bill was added to the lobbying reform bill by overwhelming support on a vote of 28 to 4 in the House Judiciary Committee, it was stripped from the larger bill by the Republican leadership in the dead of the night. Ultimately, the underlying reform bill failed to pass the Congress.

After the voters elected a Democratic House majority, in November of 2006 with a strong message of reform, I introduced a bill this year, H.R. 633. This bill required that lobbyists disclose the contributions that they bundle on behalf of a candidate. After a series of clarifications were made to the bill, it was reintroduced as H.R. 2317. This bill required that registered lobbyists disclose the contributions that they bundle for a candidate that are equal to or exceed \$5,000 on a quarterly basis. "Bundling" was defined as the physical aggregation of contributions by a lobbyist or by attribution to a lobbyist for contributions received from other sources regardless the means of transmission. This bill passed the House on May 24, 2007 382/37 and was added to the Honest Leadership, Open Government Act of 2007 by a vote of 346 to 71 on the same day.

Since the House passage of the bill, the House and Senate have been reconciling the differences between their respective bills. The Senate proposed on changing the bundling disclosure requirement by shifting the onus from the lobbyist to the candidate to disclose the receipt of contributions within reports already required under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. The FEC disclosure would reflect bundled contributions from lobbyists that exceed \$15,000 on a semi annual basis. The House receded to the Senate's demands under the condition that the reporting shift, from the Lobbying Disclosure Act to the Federal Election Campaign Act, would not compromise or diminish the transparency of the bundled contributions provided by a lobbyist

and hence, not reduce the availability of the information to the American public.

The reporting requirements in this bundling disclosure requirement apply to "bundled contributions" that have been made to the following covered entities: a candidate, political committees, party committees and Leadership PACs and Members who control Leadership PACs, and their agents.

Subparagraph (i) defines a "bundled contribution" as any contribution that is "forwarded" by a lobbyist, or the agent of the lobbyist, to a covered entity. This includes all instances where a lobbyist transfers or otherwise delivers or forwards contributions to a covered entity. It includes the transfer regardless of whether the transfer occurs in conjunction with a fundraising event or in the absence of such an event.

Subparagraph (ii) is intended to capture bundling activity where the contributions may have been solicited in the aggregate by a lobbyist but where the contributions may have been provided at different times and/or transferred from the contributor or a party other than the lobbyist but is ultimately "credited" to the lobbyist. The "credit" that the lobbyist receives can be recorded through designations or other means of recognizing that a "certain amount of money" has been "raised" by the lobbyist. However, the credit that is attributed to the lobbyist does not need to be memorialized in writing or captured within a database or any other contribution tracking system to trigger the reporting requirement. Moreover, the recognition that bundled contribution is attributed to a lobbyist does not need to be communicated back to the lobbyist; it merely means that a covered entity attributes the contribution to the lobbyist.

The term "a certain amount of money" means that the covered entity has information that a dollar amount has been raised by the lobbyist who is credited with raising the money. The term does not require that the candidate or other covered entity knows the total amount raised by the lobbyist or that the lobbyist has reached the threshold amount for reporting.

Subsection (5) requires the FEC to promulgate regulations implementing this disclosure requirement but prohibits the Commission from exempting from the disclosure requirement any lobbyist on the grounds that the lobbyist is authorized by the committee to engage in fundraising "or any other similar grounds." Moreover, this subsection explicitly prohibits the Commission from issuing a regulation to make this, or any similar grounds, the basis for an exception for the fundraising activities of certain lobbyists from the bundling disclosure requirement.

Finally, it must be noted that this provision is not designed to prohibit any action by a lobbyist. The purpose of this provision is to require disclosure. Therefore, I trust that the Commission, in its regulations, will strive to maximize the disclosure of contributions that have been bundled by lobbyists. This will bring much needed sunlight to the intersection of bundling and public policy and hopefully, will serve as a "disinfectant" to clean up any undue influence brought to bear by the use of third party contributions by lobbyists.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on suspending the rules on S. 1 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules on H.R. 180; and suspending the rules on H.R. 2347.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 8, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 763]

#### YEAS—411

Ackerman	Cohen	Gonzalez
Aderholt	Cole (OK)	Goode
Akin	Conaway	Goodlatte
Alexander	Conyers	Gordon
Allen	Cooper	Granger
Altmire	Costa	Graves
Andrews	Costello	Green, Al
Arcuri	Courtney	Green, Gene
Baca	Cramer	Grijalva
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Gutierrez
Bachus	Crowley	Hall (NY)
Baird	Cuellar	Hall (TX)
Baker	Culberson	Hare
Baldwin	Cummings	Harman
Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Hastert
Barrow	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (IL)	Hastings (WA)
Bean	Davis (KY)	Heller
Becerra	Davis, David	Hensarling
Berkley	Davis, Lincoln	Herger
Berman	Davis, Tom	Herseth Sandlin
Berry	Deal (GA)	Higgins
Biggert	DeFazio	Hill
Bilbray	DeGette	Hinche
Bilirakis	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hirono
Bishop (NY)	Dent	Hobson
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hodes
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Blumenauer	Dicks	Holden
Blunt	Dingell	Holt
Boehner	Doggett	Honda
Bonner	Donnelly	Hooley
Bono	Doolittle	Hoyer
Boozman	Doyle	Hulshof
Boren	Drake	Hunter
Boswell	Dreier	Inglis (SC)
Boucher	Duncan	Inslee
Boustany	Edwards	Israel
Boyda (KS)	Ehlers	Issa
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Jackson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Ellsworth	Jackson-Lee
Braley (IA)	Emanuel	(TX)
Broun (GA)	Emerson	Jefferson
Brown (SC)	Engel	Jindal
Brown, Corrine	English (PA)	Johnson (GA)
Buchanan	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Burgess	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Burton (IN)	Everett	Jones (OH)
Butterfield	Fallin	Jordan
Buyer	Farr	Kagen
Calvert	Fattah	Kanjorski
Camp (MI)	Feeney	Kaptur
Campbell (CA)	Ferguson	Keller
Cannon	Filner	Kennedy
Cantor	Forbes	Kildee
Capito	Fortenberry	Kilpatrick
Capps	Fossella	Kind
Capuano	Fox	King (IA)
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	King (NY)
Carnahan	Franks (AZ)	Kingston
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Kirk
Carson	Gallely	Klein (FL)
Carter	Garrett (NJ)	Kline (MN)
Castle	Gerlach	Knollenberg
Castor	Giffords	Kucinich
Chabot	Gillibrand	Kuhl (NY)
Chandler	Gillmor	Lamborn
Clyburn	Gingrey	Lampson
Coble	Gohmert	Langevin

Lantos	Nunes	Shea-Porter
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Obey	Shimkus
Latham	Oliver	Shuler
LaTourette	Ortiz	Shuster
Lee	Pallone	Simpson
Levin	Pascarell	Sires
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Skelton
Lewis (GA)	Paul	Slaughter
Lewis (KY)	Payne	Smith (NE)
Linder	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Pence	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Loeb sack	Peterson (MN)	Snyder
Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson (PA)	Solis
Lowe	Petri	Souder
Lucas	Pickering	Space
Lungren, Daniel	Pitts	Spratt
E.	Platts	Stark
Lynch	Poe	Stearns
Mack	Pomeroy	Stupak
Mahoney (FL)	Porter	Sullivan
Maloney (NY)	Price (GA)	Tauscher
Manzullo	Price (NC)	Taylor
Marchant	Pryce (OH)	Terry
Markey	Putnam	Thompson (CA)
Marshall	Radanovich	Thompson (MS)
Matheson	Rahall	Thornberry
Matsui	Ramstad	Tiahrt
McCarthy (CA)	Rangel	Tiberi
McCarthy (NY)	Regula	Tierney
McCaul (TX)	Rehberg	Towns
McCollum (MN)	Reichert	Turner
McCotter	Renzi	Udall (CO)
McCrery	Reyes	Udall (NM)
McDermott	Reynolds	Upton
McGovern	Rodriguez	Van Hollen
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Velázquez
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Visclosky
McIntyre	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Walden (OR)
McMorris	Roskam	Walsh (NY)
Rodgers	Ross	Walz (MN)
McNerney	Rothman	Wamp
Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Meeks (NY)	Royce	Schultz
Melancon	Ruppersberger	Waters
Mica	Rush	Watson
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Waxman
Miller (MI)	Salazar	Weiner
Miller (NC)	Sali	Welch (VT)
Miller, Gary	Sánchez, Linda	Weldon (FL)
Miller, George	T.	Weller
Mitchell	Sanchez, Loretta	Westmoreland
Mollohan	Sarbanes	Wexler
Moore (KS)	Saxton	Whitfield
Moore (WI)	Schakowsky	Wicker
Moran (KS)	Schiff	Wilson (NM)
Moran (VA)	Schmidt	Wilson (OH)
Murphy (CT)	Schwartz	Wilson (SC)
Murphy, Patrick	Scott (GA)	Wolf
Murphy, Tim	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Musgrave	Sensenbrenner	Wu
Myrick	Serrano	Wynn
Nadler	Sessions	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Sestak	Young (AK)
Neal (MA)	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Neugebauer	Shays	

#### NAYS—8

Abercrombie	Clay	Murtha
Barton (TX)	Cleaver	Tanner
Boyd (FL)	Flake	

#### NOT VOTING—13

Brown-Waite,	Gilchrest	McNulty
Ginny	Hayes	Ros-Lehtinen
Clarke	Johnson (IL)	Sutton
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	

□ 1157

Mr. BARTON of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. MEEKS of New York changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 763, relating to the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

#### DARFUR ACCOUNTABILITY AND DIVESTMENT ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 180, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 180, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 764]

#### YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Carson	Flake
Ackerman	Carter	Forbes
Aderholt	Castle	Fortenberry
Akin	Castor	Fossella
Alexander	Chabot	Fox
Allen	Chandler	Frank (MA)
Altmire	Clay	Franks (AZ)
Andrews	Cleaver	Frelinghuysen
Arcuri	Clyburn	Gallely
Baca	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Bachmann	Cohen	Gerlach
Bachus	Cole (OK)	Giffords
Baird	Conaway	Gillibrand
Baker	Conyers	Gillmor
Baldwin	Cooper	Gingrey
Barrett (SC)	Costa	Gohmert
Barrow	Costello	Gonzalez
Bartlett (MD)	Courtney	Goode
Barton (TX)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bean	Crenshaw	Gordon
Becerra	Crowley	Granger
Berkley	Cuellar	Graves
Berman	Culberson	Green, Al
Berry	Cummings	Green, Gene
Biggert	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Bilbray	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Hall (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)
Bishop (NY)	Davis, David	Hare
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Lincoln	Harman
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Hastert
Blumenauer	Deal (GA)	Hastings (FL)
Blunt	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	DeGette	Heller
Bonner	Delahunt	Hensarling
Bono	DeLauro	Herger
Boozman	Dent	Herseth Sandlin
Boren	Diaz-Balart, L.	Higgins
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hill
Boucher	Dicks	Hinche
Boustany	Dingell	Hinojosa
Boyd (FL)	Doggett	Hirono
Boyda (KS)	Donnelly	Hobson
Brady (PA)	Doolittle	Hodes
Brady (TX)	Doyle	Hoekstra
Braley (IA)	Drake	Holden
Broun (GA)	Dreier	Holt
Brown (SC)	Duncan	Honda
Brown, Corrine	Edwards	Hooley
Buchanan	Ehlers	Hoyer
Burgess	Ellison	Hulshof
Burton (IN)	Ellsworth	Hunter
Butterfield	Emanuel	Inglis (SC)
Buyer	Emerson	Inslee
Calvert	Engel	Israel
Camp (MI)	English (PA)	Issa
Campbell (CA)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Cannon	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee
Cantor	Everett	(TX)
Capito	Fallin	Jefferson
Capps	Farr	Jindal
Capuano	Fattah	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Feeney	Johnson, E. B.
Carnahan	Ferguson	Jones (NC)
Carney	Filner	Jones (OH)

Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell

Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—1

Paul

## NOT VOTING—13

Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Clarke  
Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann

Gilchrest  
Hayes  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
LaHood

McNulty  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Sutton  
Tancred

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1205

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## IRAN SANCTIONS ENABLING ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2347, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2347, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 6, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 765]

YEAS—408

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle

Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella

Foxx  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jindal  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller

Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell

Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)

Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—6

Abercrombie  
Bartlett (MD)

Flake  
Jones (NC)

Kucinich  
Paul

## NOT VOTING—18

Boyda (KS)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Clarke  
Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Gilchrest

Hayes  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
LaHood  
McNulty  
Miller (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen

Shuler  
Sutton  
Tancred  
Weiner  
Wexler

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1212

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize State and local governments to direct divestiture from, and prevent investment in, companies with investments of \$20,000,000 or more in Iran's energy sector, companies that sell arms to the Government of Iran, and financial institutions that extend \$20,000,000 or more in credit to the Government of Iran for 45 days or more, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 763 on final passage of S. 1, the Open Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007; rollcall No. 764 final passage of H.R. 180, the Darfur Accountability and Divestment Act; and rollcall No. 765 on final passage of H.R. 2347, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, I am not recorded because I was delayed while tending to constituents in my congressional office. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all three bills.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this morning, July 31, 2007, I was unable to cast my votes on S. 1, H.R. 180, and H.R. 2347 and wish the RECORD to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 763 on suspending the rules and passing S. 1, the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 764 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 180, the Darfur Accountability and Divestment Act, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 765 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2347, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, I would have voted "aye."

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3161, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 581 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 581

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3161) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill

and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 3161 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield my friend from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) 30 minutes. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 581.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 581 is a traditional open rule for appropriations bills. This open rule allows any amendment to be offered as long as the amendment complies with House rules.

Madam Speaker, the Agriculture appropriations bill may not get as much attention as some of the others, but it is incredibly important to the Nation. For the past 6 years, the bill has been underfunded by President Bush and the Republican Congress.

This year, the subcommittee chairwoman, ROSA DELAURO, and her colleagues have put together a bill that begins to restore cuts in funding to the Department of Agriculture; cuts that have left too many people hungry here at home and around the world; cuts that have threatened America's food security and food safety; and cuts that have denied rural America improvements and access to better technology, better housing and a better environment.

Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to say that with this bill, we have

turned the corner. The fiscal year 2008 Agriculture appropriations bill makes new and important investments in our people. This is not a perfect bill, but it is a big step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I am proud, Madam Speaker, to serve as the Cochair of the bipartisan House Hunger Caucus along with my good friend from Missouri, JO ANN EMERSON. I have a strong interest in making sure that our domestic and international hunger programs get the funding that they need.

With this bill, more pregnant women and infants will get the nutritious food they need through the WIC program. With this bill, more children who eat a school breakfast or lunch will receive meals during the summer months, when school is out of session, just like they do during the school year. With this bill, the food that they are served in school will be healthier, including more fresh fruits and vegetables. With this bill, the Commodity Food Supplemental Program can expand participation in existing States and can also begin participating in five new States.

The bill continues funding to combat hunger around the world through programs like Food for Peace and the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. There is increased funding for the Food and Drug Administration and the Food Safety and Inspection Service, allowing USDA to better oversee our Nation's food safety, and more importantly, root out any food contamination and threats to America's food supply.

Providing these agencies with the proper tools, including proper staffing, is an important part of USDA's mission that usually goes unnoticed unless a problem arises.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this bill increases funding for programs that directly affect rural America. For far too long, rural America has been underfunded and, in many cases, underappreciated. This bill increases funding for programs important to rural America, including crop insurance integrity, livestock competition, enforcement efforts at the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, the Rural Community Advancement Program, clean water and business loans and grants.

Finally, there are increases in funds for technology access that will provide grants for distance learning, telemedicine and broadband development in rural areas.

Madam Speaker, before I conclude my opening remarks, I want to address one more subject in a little bit of detail. For years we have not done nearly enough, Democrats and Republicans alike, to end hunger. I will say it again: Hunger is a political condition. We have the resources to end it. We have the infrastructure. What we need is the political will and determination to make it happen.

With passage of the fiscal year 2008 Agriculture appropriations bill and the



recently approved farm bill, this new Democratic Congress is taking a major step forward in the fight to end hunger in America and around the world. We are moving in a new direction toward a place where everybody in this world has enough to eat. We have much more work to do, but today we can make an important down payment.

Now, during consideration of this bill, we may see attempts to cut these vital, proven programs. Members will say that they, too, are troubled by hunger, but they don't want to spend the money to address it. It is the same old argument.

Additionally, during consideration of this bill, there may be an amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) that would allow State governments to privatize the Food Stamp program.

Madam Speaker, this open rule allows the gentleman from Texas to offer this amendment. I support his right to do so. However, this is bad policy that was rejected in the farm bill. As a supporter of the Food Stamp program, a program proven to provide food to hungry Americans, I strongly oppose this amendment. The State of Texas has experimented with privatizing food stamps. That experiment failed. According to a letter signed by 21 organizations opposed to the privatization of the Food Stamp program, "before the State canceled its contract with the private contractors, hundreds of thousands of low-income children and adults were unable to access nutrition and health care assistance that they desperately needed and to which they were entitled by law."

Privatization of the Food Stamp program failed in Texas. We should not put more families at risk by extending that failed experiment to other States. The amendment deserves to be defeated. I urge my colleagues to vote no if, in fact, the amendment is offered.

Madam Speaker, I will insert letters opposing privatization of the Food Stamp program into the RECORD at this point.

JULY 10, 2007.

*U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Agriculture, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: When the full House Agriculture Committee marks up the nutrition title of the Farm Bill, we urge you to oppose any effort to strike or weaken a provision clarifying the existing requirement that state civil service employees conduct the Food Stamp eligibility determination process.

This "merit-system" requirement has been part of the Food Stamp program since its inception. It is intended to protect the integrity of the program and ensure fair and equal access and treatment for all applicants.

We are extremely concerned about replication of the Texas experience of privatizing most of the work leading up to the final eligibility determination in its Food Stamp, Medicaid and TANF programs. Indiana is already proceeding down the same path despite the Texas failure. In Texas, before the state canceled its contract with the private contractors, hundreds of thousands of low income children and adults were unable to access nutrition and health care assistance

that they desperately needed and to which they were entitled by law.

When states privatize such important and inherently governmental functions, the contractors often create incentives for private companies to reduce access to the program in order to maximize their profits. "Streamlining the work" often comes at the expense of the most difficult to serve, including the elderly who have hearing problems on the phone and have no internet access, the disabled, the homeless, and people with limited English. In addition, it actually may create new inefficiencies that delay the processing of needed benefits.

Privatization is not necessary for states to modernize their application process. This spring, the Government Accounting Office documented that most states have implemented call centers and internet using their public employees. We strongly urge you to support the provisions in the subcommittee bill that clarify the merit system requirement.

Sincerely,

AFL-CIO; Coalition for Independent Living Options; Coalition on Human Needs; Congressional Hunger Center; Food Research and Action Center; Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; Migrant Legal Action Program; National Council on Aging; National Council of Jewish Women; National Education Association; National Farmers Union; National Low Income Housing Coalition; NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; OMB Watch; RESULTS; The Arc of the United States; The Salvation Army; United Automobile Workers; United Cerebral Palsy; USAction; Voices for America's Children; Wider Opportunities for Women.

JUNE 15, 2007.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing to ask for your strong support for a provision in the food stamp portion of the farm bill that reaffirms and clarifies the existing requirement for public employees in merit-based personnel systems to conduct the eligibility determination process for the food stamp program.

Over the last several years, the Bush Administration has allowed several states, without going through the required waiver process, to evade the clear Food Stamp requirement for state agencies to perform the inherently governmental function of eligibility determination.

The Texas experience was such a disaster that the state canceled the contract in a little over a year but not before the delivery system for Food Stamps and Medicaid was destabilized. The state wasted over \$100 million; hundreds of thousands of Medicaid and Food Stamp applicants either lost benefits or never got through the system to get them; and personal financial information went to a warehouse in Washington State.

Although Indiana is just in the early stages of a 10-year contract worth \$1.1 billion, early reports from some advocates are very troubling. They report an intense atmosphere of intimidation among the contract staff that is pitting their job security interests against the interests of applicants seeking nutrition and health assistance; new procedures that are likely to create formidable obstacles for many applicants to get through the process successfully; and a policy that appears to prohibit staff from discussing the application process for this public program with outside advocates for applicants.

Public disclosure, privacy protections, and impartial, fair administration are key elements in civil service and other public per-

sonnel standards. They are designed to ensure that the public has a right to and receives fair, nondiscriminatory treatment that is accountable to the taxpayers. These privatization efforts, in contrast, appear not only to shield much of the operation of the new systems, but also to reorganize them in a way that will make it very difficult for applicants to get the assistance they have a right to receive.

Increasingly, middle class workers find themselves losing good jobs and forced to take new ones at much lower pay. The instability of their jobs and the downgrading of their economic circumstances mean that they may have to resort to economic safety net programs such as the Food Stamp program for temporary help.

We strongly urge you to support the provisions clarifying the public administration requirement in the Food Stamp program. Now is not the time to put the public interest in private hands.

Sincerely,

AFSCME; AFL-CIO; American Federation of Government Employees; American Federation of Teachers; Communication Workers of America; International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; National Education Association; Service Employees International Union; The International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America; United Food and Commercial Workers International Union.

AFSCME,

*Washington, DC, July 31, 2007.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to strongly urge you to oppose an amendment by Representative Conaway to H.R. 3161, the FY 2008 Agriculture Appropriations Bill, which will be considered today. This issue is of enormous importance to my union and to the tens of millions of Americans which rely upon the Food Stamp program for nutrition assistance.

The Conaway amendment is intended to undo a provision in the nutrition title of H.R. 2419 which the House passed last week. That provision clarified the longstanding requirement in the Food Stamp Act that civil service employees conduct the eligibility determination process for Food Stamps. It was necessary because the Administration has reinterpreted the Food Stamp law to allow Texas and Indiana to turn over to private companies most of the eligibility determination process to private companies.

The Texas experiment was a disaster. The State canceled its own contract after about 14 months but not before thousands of families failed to receive benefits to which they were entitled, and sensitive personal and financial information went astray. Now Indiana is proceeding down the same path.

The provision reinforcing the public administration requirement in the Food Stamp program was thoroughly debated in the Agriculture Committee, and several amendments to strike or modify it were defeated. The bottom line is that privatization of the eligibility of the Food Stamp program will open up the floodgates to major costs in benefits for the most vulnerable of our citizens.

AFSCME strongly urges you to oppose the Conaway amendment or any other similar amendment.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. LOVELESS,  
*Director of Legislation.*

Madam Speaker, the fiscal year 2008 Agriculture appropriations bill was written and considered in a bipartisan way through the committee process. It is a bill that should receive strong bipartisan support in the House. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule. I support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, this Agricultural, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration appropriations bill provides more than \$18.8 billion in discretionary spending for the next fiscal year. This bill represents an increase in spending by nearly 6 percent over last year's bill and continues the trend of the Democrat majority choosing to provide spending increases well above the rate of inflation and putting each taxpayer in the country on a path towards an average \$3,000 increase in their Federal tax bill. Madam Speaker, this is too great a burden for the American taxpayer to pay.

As many of my colleagues know, I represent one of the premier agriculture districts in the country. Central Washington is rightfully famous for its apples, cherries, wine and many other farm and ranch products. The programs funded under this bill are of great importance to the communities I represent, and there are some provisions in the bill that I do indeed support.

For example, I am pleased that funding is maintained for rural development, which provides critical financial help to rural communities across the country. This bill also fully funds the Natural Resources Conservation Service, which provides on-the-ground technical assistance to farmers and ranchers dealing with soil and water management issues. I also note that this bill maintains a provision that I have long supported which allows Americans to be able to purchase drugs in other countries at lower prices and bring them back to the United States lawfully.

However, Madam Speaker, I am very disappointed that this bill cuts Agriculture Research Service funding by over \$50 million compared to last year. I represent three Agriculture Research Service labs, two of which are collocated with Washington State University research facilities. Federally sponsored agriculture research not only improves crop productivity, it also helps farmers and ranchers find solutions to

environmental and marketing challenges.

Many agriculture research initiatives were already facing the prospect of cutting essential research programs and researchers. Surely, Madam Speaker, with such a big increase over last year's spending level, we could have found room to at least protect the level of research being conducted today.

I am concerned about the potential impacts of these cuts and what it would mean for facilities in my district, in particular the Agriculture Research Service lab in Prosser. I intend to continue to work with my colleagues from Washington to ensure that we provide the funding necessary to maintain the important agriculture research activities already underway at these facilities.

I am also disappointed that this bill provides only \$10 million for the Specialty Crops Block Grant program. This program provides grants distributed by the State departments of agriculture to assist the development, production and marketing of fruits and vegetables. Earlier this year, I joined a bipartisan group of my colleagues in asking that this program be fully funded at the \$44.5 million level. This bill falls far short on this account.

Madam Speaker, if we pass this rule today, the House will begin consideration of the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration appropriations bill. While this must be accomplished in a timely manner, the Senate in fact will not begin consideration of this bill until September and there is, frankly, a more pressing issue facing our Nation today.

Watching the news and reading the newspapers, Americans are reminded each day that the United States remains vulnerable to another terrorist attack. It is vital that our laws keep us one step ahead of the terrorists, but currently, Madam Speaker, we lag behind.

Right now, Federal law ties the hands of our intelligence community, causing them to miss significant portions of intelligence, all because technological advances have outpaced Federal law. We cannot wait to respond only after another attack. We must act today.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I will be calling on my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. By defeating the previous question, we will give Members the ability to vote today on the merits of changing current law to ensure our intelligence community has the tools they need to protect our Nation from a potentially imminent terrorist attack.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, I just want to make a couple of observations. I find it somewhat ironic that my Republican friends, on the one hand, complain about the size of the bill, the overall amount of money that

has been put into this bill; and then they complain about the programs that haven't been funded enough on the other hand. You can't have it both ways. I guess there is no pleasing them.

The other thing, too, is the vote on the previous question has nothing to do with the underlying bill. But I will remind my colleagues that in addition to the many good things that this bill does for rural America and for farmers and for feeding hungry people, there is a national security component to this bill as well. This bill contains money to help protect the American people from contaminated food that may cross our borders into our country. This is about food security. So this is a vital part of protecting the American people, and I don't think that should be lost.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as a subcommittee chairman on the House Agriculture Committee and as a member of the Rules Committee, I am pleased to rise in support of the Agriculture appropriations bill before us today.

One of the reasons the farm bill that we just passed last week was so hard to put together was over the past years the Republican appropriators had repeatedly chipped millions and millions of dollars out of mandatory farm bill programs, specifically in the area of research, and research is an area that has been woefully inadequately funded in previous years. As a result, the rest of the world has been catching up, and we have been struggling to maintain our preeminence in agriculture in the last few years.

We used to have a \$30 billion trade surplus in agriculture, and now, like in everything else, we are falling behind and having that traded away. If we aren't careful, we are going to become a net importer of agriculture for the first time in the history of the United States. It is bad enough that countries like China, Japan and Saudi Arabia are already our bankers. We cannot afford to let them become our farmers, too.

This bill represents a stark difference from the drastic cuts we have seen in recent years. Members of the Agriculture Committee and the Appropriations Committee were vigilant to ensure that we met the promises we made, especially in the areas of research, food safety and nutrition.

I do have some concerns, however, about the horse slaughter transportation language contained in the bill which could have unintended consequences on the horse racing industry, an industry I have strongly supported since my time in the California legislature.

□ 1230

I am hearing from a lot of my constituents back home that have serious

problems with the potential workability and practicality of some of that language. My good friend from California (Mr. COSTA) and I are working with Mr. CHANDLER and Chairwoman DELAURO to correct this problem.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill. It follows through on our commitments, reinvests in rural America, improves nutrition for millions of Americans, and puts us on the right track by making sound investment in research, and will help us maintain our standing in the world as undisputed agricultural leaders.

I also want to thank and say something about our wonderful chairwoman, Ms. DELAURO. Without her help, we would not have been able to write the farm bill we wrote last week. She is a tireless advocate for her concerns in specialty crops and farmers markets and nutrition and making sure that our young people eat nutritious food, and also food safety. With her leadership, we got the farm bill done. With the leadership of COLLIN PETERSON, we got the farm bill done. And with the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, we were able to write a good farm bill for America.

I want to thank the chairwoman and all those who helped. She has done an unbelievable job shepherding this bill through her committee and to the House floor. I thank her and congratulate her on meeting the needs of America's farmers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise reluctantly today to point out something that I think is incredibly important. The ag work that you have all done is important, and agriculture is certainly an important part of our American economy. And our ability to feed ourselves is critical to our national security.

But we also have another national security issue of which we cannot get the attention that it so deserves. After 9/11, we put together these commissions, the 9/11 Commission, to say, Hey, what went wrong?

We decided we would merge a whole department together and call it the Department of Homeland Security to best meet the needs and safety and security of the homeland. We did all of these things in preparation for what we knew was likely to occur, and that is certainly another attempt by terrorists to attack the United States of America.

And one of the things that we did through all of that is said we have to give law enforcement, our intelligence services, every tool that we can find to make America safe, because we have asked a lot of them.

We have said we want you to go to the most dangerous places in the world and find bad guys and stop terrorist plots against the homeland. We told our FBI to work long hours and week-

ends, spending a lot of time away from their families, to make sure that no terrorist plot is successful in the United States of America.

But today, we allow more conversations between known terrorists overseas talking to known or unknown terrorists overseas to go unheard because of a quirk in the law. We have been asking day after day, week after week, month after month, please, for the safety and security of the United States of America, let's have the courage to fix this law so we can protect America.

Right now and today, there is a terrorist conversation happening overseas that we are not allowing our law enforcement, our intelligence services, to monitor. Overseas, with non-United States citizens. I was an FBI agent for about 6 years, and I understand and appreciate the probable cause standard of which we engage to American citizens, and it is right that we do that. It is right that it is difficult to get a warrant to intercept their conversations because that is who we are in America and we should cherish it for our citizens.

But to tell them that we expect them to stop terrorist attacks against America, and we allow all of these known conversations to go unlistened to at a time when we know that they are heightening up to do something is irresponsible, if not criminal.

This is important what you talk about. This is more important. We should not leave this Chamber today, tomorrow, or at the end of the week without fixing this critical national security problem to the United States of America. It is wrong. We have soldiers in harm's way. We have intelligence officials in harm's way. We have domestic law enforcement in harm's way. Let's stand with them today, defeat this rule, fix this problem, and move on to the other important issues of the day. It is that important.

And don't kid ourselves. We cannot kid ourselves, Madam Speaker. This is that serious. You know, when a very distinguished member of the Cabinet stands up and says "I have a gut feeling," that is not a gut feeling. It is based on a whole series of pieces of information that doesn't say when or where or what, but it says something is happening. There is a ramp-up. There is lots of activity; there is lots of chatter. Something is going on, and yet we stand here blinded. We can't hear. We are not allowing them to see where the trouble is next brewing. It is wrong. We need to fix it.

We should stand in unanimity today and defeat the previous question so that we can fix this problem and move on and keep America safe.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am sorry my friends on the other side of the aisle don't seem to put a high priority on agriculture and on the need to support our farmers and the need to feed hungry people in this country.

You want to talk about a national security challenge, there are 35 million

Americans in this country today who are either hungry or food insecure, in large part because of the Republican agenda to erode the safety net over the last several years.

There is money in this bill for food safety and inspection, money to support the Food and Drug Administration so people don't get contaminated drugs.

No, I am not going to yield to the gentleman.

These are vital national security interests. And it is about time we get our priorities straight. We need to pass this bill, just as we needed to pass the farm bill to help fix the damage that they have done over the last several years. So enough is enough. This is an important bill. If you don't think it is an important bill, then vote down the rule. Defeat the rule so we don't debate issues like agriculture and food security and support for the hungry in this country.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his extraordinary leadership, along with the Chair of the subcommittee, my colleague from Connecticut, for her lead on nutrition.

We are in the process of changing priorities in this country. Today, the House will be taking up the 11th of 12 appropriation bills where we will continue the process of taking this country in a new direction.

This agricultural appropriations bill makes a solid statement of confidence in the future of rural America, and it makes a solid statement of recognition about the diversity and vitality of our rural economy.

Let me just mention a few things that highlight what this program is doing.

Number one, a strong farm economy where we have our farmers being the custodian of our landscape requires conservation; \$980 million is in this bill for conservation.

Rural development is critical to our economy. Broadband, among other things, is a major investment in this bill, and we are treating the rural economy with broadband, much like we did with electricity. That has to be a full partner, not a second-class citizen when it comes to the development of the infrastructure that is essential to building our economy.

A strong rural economy is based on a well-fed country, and that means prosperous farmers. There is a record \$13.9 billion for school meal programs, \$39.8 billion for food stamps, and \$5.6 billion for the Women, Infant and Children program.

There is also in this bill, as the gentleman from California has said, a major investment in nutritious food, vegetables and fruit. And I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on that.

This bill and this rule is going to take America forward. A strong rural economy is essential to America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I am disappointed my friend from Massachusetts would not respond to my asking him to yield when he spoke just a moment ago, and I am not discounting at all how important the provisions in this agriculture bill, how important they are, notwithstanding some of the problems that I have.

But this issue that we are talking about, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, is very important and it is timely right now. Right now.

Let me explain how this process works, because this does not slow down. And I shouldn't say it doesn't slow it down; it slows it down for one hour. Can't we take 1 hour to debate this issue?

If the previous question is defeated, and I will call for it to be defeated on the floor. If it is defeated, then the rule will be amended to take up the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act amendments for one hour to debate up or down.

This issue is very, very important and it is timely that it gets acted on before Congress leaves for the August district work period. So this does not slow down agriculture. It is not saying anything disparaging about agriculture.

And, frankly, Madam Speaker, I should know. I live in an agriculture-based economy. All of my neighbors are involved, in one way or the other, in agriculture. So I should know the importance of it.

But I also know the importance of taking up this issue regarding FISA and doing it right now, doing it this week, doing it today, by defeating the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 7½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the Chair of the subcommittee, who has done an incredible job putting this bill together, a bill which will help feed millions of people in this country and around the world.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his concern and his compassion and his indefatigable work on the issue of making sure that those in our Nation who are hungry are able to get the food that they need in order to be able to sustain themselves.

I also want to say a thank-you to my colleague from California for his kind words and working with him on the farm bill.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to debating this bill and discussing our priorities. We are going to cover a lot of ground today with a wide ranging portfolio to accomplish quite a lot.

This appropriation covers many subjects. But what runs through every element of this bill is the common thread of our Nation assuming responsibility again for the things we are supposed to get right: keeping our country safe and healthy, preserving and strengthening our rural traditional communities, and thinking about problems that we have on the horizon, like energy, and not just thinking about today's problems.

I want to say thank you to Chairman OBEY for his leadership and to our ranking member, Congressman KINGSTON, a partner in this effort. I believe together we have crafted a strong and bipartisan, responsible bill.

Our top priority has always been to move with a clear purpose in a direction towards several key goals: strengthening rural America; protecting public health; improving nutrition for more Americans; transforming our energy future; supporting conservation; investing in research; and finally, enhancing oversight.

Our bill provides total discretionary resources of \$18.8 billion, \$1 billion or 5.7 percent above 2007 and \$987.4 million or 5.5 percent above the budget request. To be sure, a full 95 percent of the increase above the budget request, or \$940 million, is used to restore funding that was either eliminated or cut in the President's budget, to acknowledge and to meet our obligation to hundreds of communities and millions of Americans.

When it comes to strengthening rural America, our first goal, our efforts have been critical to try to facilitate growth and to soften the impact of population loss in rural America. This bill provides \$23.1 million in grants to rural areas for critical community facilities such as health care, education, public safety, day-care facilities. It also provides increases in the community facility loan programs. It provides \$10 million more than the President requested for distance learning telemedicine grants, and it includes \$728.8 million to support community facilities, water and waste disposal systems, and business grants.

We also make significant investments in rural housing: \$212.2 million to fund \$5.1 billion in affordable loans to provide housing to low-income and moderate-income families in rural areas, providing approximately 38,000 single-family homeownership opportunities.

On our second priority, protecting public health, the subcommittee stepped up from spinach and seafood to peanut butter and pet food. This has shown that our food safety system is dangerously inadequate and that we must transform the way we meet our obligation to protect the public health. So the bill provides \$1.7 billion for the Food and Drug Administration, \$128.5 million over 2007, \$62 million over the budget request, and the first step in a fundamental transformation in the regulation of food safety at the FDA.

□ 1245

The bill directs the FDA to submit a plan to begin changing its approach to food safety when it submits the fiscal year 2009 budget, giving the committee time to review the plan before the funds to implement it become available on July 1, 2008.

We can help with additional resources, but there's also a need to have a corresponding commitment from management to perform its duties.

Funds are provided specifically to begin a critical transformation in food safety regulation, enhanced drug safety functions, review direct-to-consumer ads and review generic drugs.

Our next goal was improving nutrition, and I am proud of the progress we made on this issue. With the farm bill last week, this bill includes \$39.8 billion for the Food Stamp program to meet increased participation and ensure rising food prices do not diminish families' purchasing power.

The bill also provides record funding for two fundamental food security programs which our country's most vulnerable population: the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, the WIC program, and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. These efforts go hand-in-hand with ongoing initiatives.

\$957.7 million for nutrition programs to confront our Nation's obesity, instilling better eating habits in our children, giving them the tools and choices to avoid diabetes and other dangerous health conditions.

It includes record funding of \$68.5 million for the expanded Food and Nutrition Education program; \$26 million to expand the fresh fruit and vegetables and the Simplified Summer Food Program to all States; and \$10 million for specialty crops, yes, for fruits and vegetables.

And when it comes to other key objectives, transforming our energy future, supporting conservation and investing in research, we step up with this bill. This legislation strengthens bioenergy and renewable energy research \$1.2 billion, including loans and grants in rural areas. It restores many of the conservation programs slated for elimination in the President's request, including grazing lands, conservation initiatives, the Wildlife Habitat Program, watershed rehabilitation; and provides \$979.4 million to continue assistance to landowners for conservation efforts on private land.

And yes, with regard to research, \$178 million for cooperative State research education and extension service, and \$108.9 million of that is for research and education. Overall, we have increased research.

Finally, the bill is dedicated to enhanced oversight. We share the concern about fraud, waste and abuse, and we have key language in here which would allow the risk management agencies to use up to \$11.2 million in mandatory crop insurance funds to strengthen its ability to oversee the program by

maintaining and upgrading IT systems and other methods of detecting dubious claims.

I'm proud of the bill, its priorities and the goals that we set out to accomplish. I will continue to discuss some of the obligations of this bill later today, and the Congress has chosen to highlight and return to after many long years of inaction and silence. I'll continue to discuss and recognize the values and the priorities that my colleagues and I have sought to uphold, to strengthen and to honor with this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the ranking member of the Ag appropriations committee, Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chairman pro tempore of the Rules Committee for an open rule on this. I think it is important, and we appreciate that.

I certainly thank the chairman of the committee, Ms. DELAURO, for her hard work on it, and I have had a lot of input on it. We've had a lot of good debate on this bill. So it is my intention to support it, but I do have some concerns about the rules which I will address later, but I wanted to go over the bill a little bit.

First of all, I wanted to get Members a little bit focused on the Ag overall picture. Number one, the whole bill is about \$100 billion. We're actually debating \$18 billion. There's another \$79 billion in what we call around here mandatory spending, which is not mandatory, by the way. It is just that we don't want to go back to the bottom line and start all over again. That's what the farm bill's going to do or whatever, but I just wanted to point out, it's real important that the ag programs are actually about one-third of the entire bill, that there's a lot of nonagriculture, nondirect farm programs.

That's important because the rural community comes under such criticism that, well, why is the farm bill so big when less than 2 percent of our population are farmers? Well, the reason is, of course they feed 100 percent of us and we all eat their product, which is food. I wanted to point that out and then show you this mandatory versus discretionary portion of the bill.

The red portion we don't really debate; we don't control in the Appropriations Committee. That's what they do in the Ag Committee, and I don't think they did a very good job this particular year in all the parts of it because they didn't delve into some of this stuff.

The discretionary portion, again, is \$18 billion. It's above last year's, and it's about a 3.6 percent increase over last year, or 5.9 percent. Because of that, it's going to be a veto target by the President. The Republican Party says the spending level is too high, and

I think that we have to know that we can't pass this by a veto-proof majority, and so perhaps if we went back to the drawing board here it would be good.

The second point I want to make ties directly into this debate that's going on on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Now, this agriculture bill, should we pass it tonight or tomorrow, will go to the Senate, and it will sit, and unlike wine, it doesn't get better over time. It just sits, and what's going to happen, more and more people will delve in and more and more special interests will, and it will pile up with the rest of the appropriation bills.

It's a little bit silly. In fact, we're maybe like the little lab rats going round and round in a circle in hopes of getting somewhere when we know dog-gone good and well all that's going to happen in the Senate is this thing is going to sit. And yet, because of that, because of our urgency to pass Agriculture, we're going to ignore the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. And it doesn't make sense not to just stop a minute or an hour and get that done and then come back to Agriculture because it is not going to move.

There's some concerns also that I wanted to bring out when it comes to the Food and Nutrition Service. Now, my friend Mr. MCGOVERN has worked very hard on hunger, and he has a sincere passion for that, which is important. But the charge that we have underfunded hunger in the past years under Republican control is really not accurate at all.

Here is the spending chart on food and nutrition programs since 2001, and as you can see, it goes up in a linear manner, and now under the Democrat rule it goes up about the same. There's not some huge deficit in hunger. In fact, I would say to you quite clearly, we spent more time talking about obesity than we did hunger, and I'm not saying hunger's not something that we all have a lot of concern about, but let's make no mistake. The spending on nutrition and food has gone up steadily under Republican control, as it has under Democrat control.

I want to say also, I don't think increasing food stamps participation is an achievement that the U.S. Congress should be patting itself on the back. We should move to getting people independent, not more dependent on government largess. We need to work with people to get them independent. And so often our poverty brokers in this world have a perverse incentive to make sure people don't become independent, and I think we need to be mindful of that on any government program.

The Chair has pointed out what we're doing on renewable energy, and that is something that we think the Ag can and should lead on with ethanol and biodiesel and cellulosic ethanol. We've taken great strides in this bill, and I am confident that we are going to have some great progress and great bragging rights on that.

One other issue that we're going to get into later is this overgrab on the horse regulation that, if this bill passes in its current form, you will not be able to export your horse or import a horse. That's not the business of the Federal Government, at least not in a constitutional sense. I believe that a horse is private property and that you should have the right to sell your horse to folks in Canada and Mexico, if you so choose, or take it to a horse show over there. We will debate that later, and I thank the gentleman and I thank the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just respond to the gentleman briefly by saying if the Republican Congress over the years has done such a good job in combating hunger and food insecurity in this country, why are there 35 million Americans that are categorized as hungry and food insecure?

In response to the idea that we want more Americans to be "independent," we all want that. The bottom line is that Republican policies which took away indexing of food stamps back in 1996 has made it possible for many people not to be able to transition for food stamps.

The fact of the matter is the majority of people who are on food stamps today are working families. They are trying to be independent. They're working hard, and yet because we have failed to index food stamps to keep up with the cost of living, we've all given ourselves pay raises here. So obviously we feel the cost of living does have an impact, but yet we haven't done it to the most vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

I rise in opposition to the rule and also to the underlying Ag bill for a couple of reasons. One is the current trend that we're seeing played out on the floor of the House. We saw it last week as we addressed the farm bill, and it seems like the bill that once was designed to make sure that we had a low-cost, stable food supply is moving money out of the rural areas and being hijacked into the urban areas.

And you look at the pie chart of the total funding of the Ag appropriation that was used earlier, you can see that 35 percent of this pie chart is the agricultural side of the programs and 60 percent, almost two-thirds, is the domestic food assistance. Now, nobody thinks it's bad to feed people who are having a tough time, and we must be doing a very good job of it because the number one problem for people in poverty today is obesity. Maybe we're giving them the wrong foods. We should go back to the basic foods that we present them, but this big shift in funding is accentuated in the current farm bill that was passed last week.

The farm commodity portion in the bill that we passed last week is only 14 percent of total spending, and if you look at how it's been reduced in this Ag appropriations bill, it's a continuation of movement from helping the rural areas, moving it into the urban areas. And I think that's a reflection that only 2 percent of our population are farmers in America today.

In small States like the ones that I represent, in Kansas with only 3 million people, we only have four Representatives. And when we try to fight for rural development and for rural agricultural programs, we hope that we can keep our economy strong in those rural areas. But we also want to make sure that the benefits that were designed to keep a low-cost, stable food supply don't get hijacked and sent to the urban areas. This is something that I believe has developed just over this last year.

In the past, just a short story, how we have given farmers more opportunity in the past, now that has changed in Ag policy. Opportunity is dwindling for farmers.

In 1996, we had four farmers in Kansas who raised cotton. The farm bill then, the Freedom to Farm Act, allowed farmers to expand their product lines. Now we have over 50,000 acres of cotton in Kansas. We have a dozen cotton gins. We expanded their financial base a lot by giving them more opportunity.

Under the current plan, which is exhibited here with the shifting of emphasis to the urban areas, we're taking a lot of the opportunity away from the farmers and giving them less opportunity, while more opportunity is going to the urban areas.

So I'm opposed to this bill. I'm opposed to the rule because I don't think it gives us an opportunity to turn this trend around. I don't think it gives us an opportunity to get the assistance where we need it in the rural areas so we can develop the infrastructure necessary to build a strong economy to allow the agriculture to grow for the future so we have a low-cost, stable food supply well into the future.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, just in brief response to the gentleman, this is an open rule. He can amend this any way he wants to. We hear complaints from the other side that they want more openness. This is as open as you can get.

So I don't know why he would have a problem with the rule. Obviously we have different priorities in the underlying bill, but he can amend this any way he wants. That's what an open rule allows him to do.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut to counter some of the arguments that were just made.

Ms. DELAURO. I just want to let the gentleman from Kansas understand about feeding programs in the United

States, and I will get a copy for you, send it over to you, something called the Carsey report that just came about a week, a week and a half ago, which talks about 40 percent, 40 percent of children in rural America are dependent on food stamps.

This bill has gone a great distance to address the issues of rural America, including the farm issues of trying to link what is produced on the land with those who are in need of food, trying to deal with an opportunity to create a more stable economy in rural America when the President's budget, in fact, has left rural America pretty much decimated; \$940 million of this bill and this increase has been placed to restore the programs mainly in rural America that the administration had either cut back or eliminated.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington, and I would like to respond to the gentlelady from Connecticut. It is true, the Carsey report is true that 40 percent of rural America does rely on food stamps. The problem is, there is a lot of poverty there because we have not done the right thing on building infrastructure in the rural areas.

It's the shift from this low-cost stable food supply we have had in the past and the help we had to build that infrastructure. The finances are now shifting to the urban areas because we have so many urban Members of Congress. The Democrat leadership has been allowing that to happen.

It's true there are \$940 million put in this bill for the rural areas, but it's an \$18 billion bill. It has \$18 billion; \$940 million of it is not a very big chunk of that.

I just think that we are seeing a bad trend here in America. The Democrat leadership is allowing this trend to continue where resources are being shifted out of the rural areas, because there are a high number of urban Members of Congress, and they are leaving farmers vulnerable who are trying to keep this low-cost stable food supply available, and trying to keep the agricultural exports growing.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The House of Representatives is expected to adjourn later this week for the August district work period. This district work period gives Members the opportunity to leave this humid area in Washington D.C. to work in their respective districts and listen to what is on the minds of the people that we all represent. Congressional ratings are at an all-time low, and I feel that is in part due to the fact that Congress is failing to address pressing issues.

I am asking my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, as I mentioned earlier. Voting "no" will not delay the consideration of the Ag-

ricultural, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration appropriations bill.

Let me qualify that. It will delay it for 1 hour. It will, however, give Members the opportunity to vote on the merits of updating current law so that our intelligence community has the tools it needs to monitor the telephone conversations of foreign terrorists physically located in foreign countries. Let me repeat that, foreign terrorists in foreign countries.

I hope that the Democrat majority will not stall any longer in allowing the House to vote on this very vital issue. Each minute we wait to act, our Intelligence Committee could be missing vital information, therefore increasing our risk of another attack on U.S. soil.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous material prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just say I am disappointed with my colleague from Washington and others who have come to the floor to try to bring back an oldy but goody that the Republicans like to invoke, and that is the politics of fear. Maybe Karl Rove went down to the Republican National Committee and briefed them and said everything else is failing for the Republicans, they are at an all-time low in the public opinion poll, so trot out the politics of fear again and scare the American people.

Well, the fact of the matter is, as the gentleman knows, the administration, the Bush administration, and the Speaker's Office are in negotiations on trying to reach an accommodation on this FISA issue. If you don't believe me, it was in Congressional Quarterly. What Congressional Quarterly also stated was that the Republicans in the House, however, were trying to drag their feet.

If you don't want to join in the deliberation, that's your problem. We will work something out, hopefully with the administration, and bring this issue to closure.

But let me say one other thing why we need to be very, very careful on this. We need to be very, very careful about giving even more broad unchecked authority to Alberto Gonzales and his crew. Quite frankly, I wouldn't trust the Attorney General to tell me the correct time, never mind stand up and defend the civil liberties of anybody. That's why Democrats are continuing to work with the White House to get a tough, smart FISA bill to put together, and I expect that we will do that. What the gentleman and others are going to decide to do right now is plain politics.



Back to the main subject here, which is the farm bill. This is a good bill for farmers. This is a good bill for people who are vulnerable, who have been shortchanged by the administration in the Republican Congresses when it comes to food security. This is a good bill for America.

I congratulate the distinguished gentlelady from Connecticut for working together so hard to put together a bill we can be proud of. Vote "yes" on the previous question, and vote "yes" on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 581 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 3. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider the bill (H.R. 3138) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to update the definition of electronic surveillance. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what

they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from *Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary"*: "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative Plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title.

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that courts with fiduciary responsibility for a child of a deceased member of the Armed Forces who receives a death gratuity payment under section 1477 of title 10, United States code, should take into consideration the expression of clear intent of the member regarding the distribution of funds on behalf of the child.

#### LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 579, proceedings will now resume on the bill (H.R. 2831) to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Americans With Disabilities

Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Monday, July 30, 2007, 6 minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each control 3 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, in order to speak in favor of this restoration of the law, I am pleased to acknowledge the majority leader of the House for 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, when the Supreme Court wrongly decides a case, as they do from time to time, particularly when congressional intent is at issue, the United States Congress can and should act to remedy it. That is precisely what this carefully crafted measured legislation, the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007, is designed to do.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and I thank the ranking member as well for the work that they do on this committee.

Make no mistake. The Court's 5-4 decision on May 29 in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear* was wrongly decided. The merits of Lilly Ledbetter's wage discrimination claim seemed beyond doubt. A Federal jury agreed that she was discriminated against. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission agreed with Ms. Ledbetter's claims, although the Bush administration switched its position once the case got to the Supreme Court.

Most importantly, Lilly Ledbetter was paid less than all of her male counterparts, all of her male counterparts, even those who had less seniority. This clearly was not a case where her performance was suspect. Goodyear gave her a top performance award in 1996.

The fact is, the Court majority took an extremely cramped view of the title VII of the Civil Rights Act, holding that Ms. Ledbetter and claimants like her must file their pay discrimination claims within 180 days of the original discriminatory act. In other words, even if the discriminatory acts continued, every week, every biweek, every month, that they would have to look back to the original first check.

There are at least three serious problems with the Court's flawed analysis. First, the unlawful discrimination against Ms. Ledbetter did not begin and end with Goodyear's original decision to pay her less than they paid her male counterparts.

In fact, every paycheck that Lilly Ledbetter received after Goodyear's decision to pay her less was a continuing manifestation of Goodyear's illegal discrimination. As Justice Ginsburg said

in dissent, each subsequent paycheck was "infected" by the original decision to unlawfully discriminate.

Secondly, the Court dismissed the realities of the workplace far too casually. Detecting pay discrimination is not easy, and sometimes it may take years to uncover.

Now, each of us in this body knows what the other Member of the body makes, but that is not true in almost every workplace in America. Why? Because people generally do not talk openly with their coworkers about their salaries, raises and bonuses. In fact, many employers strive to keep such information confidential.

Just consider, Ms. Ledbetter apparently did not become aware that she had been discriminated against until she received an anonymous letter alerting her to the discrimination.

Third, the Court majority ignored its own holdings that Congress intended title VII, the majority ignored its own holdings that Congress intended title VII to have a broad, remedial purpose, to make persons whole for injuries suffered on accounts of unlawful employment discrimination.

Finally, let me say that those who claim that this bill somehow eliminates the statute of limitations are incorrect. Under this bill, as we thought the law was for 30 years, an employee must still file a charge within the statutory filing period after receiving a discriminatory paycheck.

This bill is fair, it is just, and it comports with the intent of this Congress in passing the Civil Rights Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to make sure that what Congress intended is, in fact, what the law remains.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I would urge our colleagues in both the Republican and Democratic Parties to vote "yes" in favor of this bill.

The opponents have raised two arguments. I believe both of them are wrong.

The first is that the bill repeals or eliminates the statute of limitations. This is not correct. What is, in fact, correct, is that once 180 days have passed from the final act of discrimination, the final tainted paycheck, then the plaintiff's claim would be barred.

The second argument that has been raised by the opponents of the bill is that there would be a flood of litigation and a flood of claims that would vex employers across the country.

This is not so. We are restoring the law as it has existed for more than three decades. During those three decades, there was no such flood or plague of litigation.

This conclusion is borne out by the Congressional Budget Office, which, in analyzing the costs of this bill, concluded that there would be no appreciable increase in the number of claims filed with the EEOC.

So, for these reasons and others, the arguments raised against the bill are

invalid. Members should vote "yes" in favor of the bill.

□ 1315

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

We have had a good debate last night and this morning, and the other side has tried to make this an emotional debate about discrimination, but that is not debate. We all, both Democrat and Republican, oppose discrimination.

Madam Speaker, in Congress bad process usually makes for bad product. Let there be no mistake, the process that brought H.R. 2831 to the floor today was incredibly sloppy. Likewise, the product itself could not be sloppier. The title of this bill should be, "The End of the Statute of Limitations."

This bill was hastily patched together by the Education and Labor Committee Democrats at the behest of the House majority leadership with the hope of grabbing a few headlines just a month after the Supreme Court's decision to uphold the 1964 Civil Rights Act statute of limitations.

Neither House Republicans nor many key outside stakeholders were consulted as the bill was drafted, and the bill was not considered at a single legislative hearing. Then, again, at the behest of the House Democrat leadership, the Rules Committee granted a completely closed rule, locking out nearly 400 Members from amending or even considering amendments for this legislation.

Had this bill truly been a narrow fix, as its supporters would have the American people believe, this sloppy process may not have been such a problem. However, this is a major fundamental change to civil rights law and no less than four separate statutes.

The last change to civil rights law of this magnitude, the 1991 Civil Rights Act, took 2 years of negotiation, debate, and bipartisan accord to accomplish. By comparison, this bill took just 2 months. It cheapens our legislative process and, indeed, it cheapens the work that has gone into decades of serious considerate civil rights law-making. The legislative product itself, as my Republican colleagues and I have discussed, is no less flawed. It guts the statute of limitations contained in current law and, in so doing, would allow an employee to bring a claim against an employer decades after the alleged initial act of discrimination occurred. And trial lawyers, you can be sure, are salivating at this prospect.

Madam Speaker, this is a bad bill that is the result of an equally bad process. The President has threatened to veto it should it arrive at his desk, and rightfully so. But we should never let it get to that point. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is a narrow bill that supports a very broad principle. The broad principle is that discrimina-

tion has no place in the lives of Americans.

This House has people working in it whose families came here who could not speak English but now their sons and daughters write the law. This House has people in it whose ancestors were brought here as slaves but now who write the law of the land. And this House has one person in it whose grandmother could not vote but who now is the woman who is Speaker of the House of Representatives. When we eliminate discrimination, great things happen in America. When we restore discrimination, America moves backwards.

This country is bigger and stronger than the worst thoughts of any bigot. Discrimination has no place in our law, no place in our hearts, and no place because of technicalities. Vote "yes" in favor of restoring this strong tool against discrimination.

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and commend my Chairman, Mr. MILLER for his efforts to bring this legislation forward. The Supreme Court's decision in Ledbetter versus Goodyear was a setback for fundamental equal rights. As a Member of the Education and Labor Committee I am pleased that the House is standing up today for America's workers by essentially invalidating this misguided ruling.

Mrs. Ledbetter's pay discrimination case was dismissed—not because she was not being discriminated against—but because the Supreme Court believed she filed her claim too late.

Under this decision, employees in Ledbetter's position are forced to live with discriminatory paychecks for the rest of their careers. Moreover, the Court's decision ignores the realities of the workplace—where employees generally do not know enough about what their co-workers earn or how decisions regarding pay are made to file a complaint precisely when discrimination first occurs.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act would clarify that every paycheck resulting from a discriminatory pay decision constitutes a violation of the Civil Rights Act.

When the Supreme Court sanctions discrimination through technicalities or misinterpretation, it is the job of Congress to clarify the intent of the law. We start this process today by passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. I urge all my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2831.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2831, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007. I regret that this legislation is even necessary in the 21st Century, but even today, we see instances of pay discrimination time and time again.

The reason we are bringing this legislation to the Floor today is because unfortunately, activist judges on the U.S. Supreme Court have changed the rules to make it much, much harder for an employee suffering pay discrimination to bring his or her case to court.

Prior to that case, an employee had 180 days from her previous paycheck to file a lawsuit for pay discrimination. However, five members of the Supreme Court, led by Justice Samuel Alito, changed those rules. Now, an employee has 180 days from the time of the decision to file a lawsuit.

However, oftentimes it is extremely difficult to know when pay discrimination is occurring. In the Supreme Court case under which the new rules were decided, Lilly Ledbetter filed her lawsuit because she was being paid far less than the lowest paid male employee holding the same position as hers. And she only found out about this because an anonymous person slipped her a note that showed her that fact.

There was no way that Ms. Ledbetter could have known about her pay discrimination if she had not received this anonymous note. However, the five Supreme Court Justices decided that she could not sue because it had been more than 180 days since her employers had decided to pay her less than the men.

This legislation is not only beneficial to employees, it is good for employers as well. With the current strict time limits, employees have more of an incentive to file lawsuits if they suspect discrimination, simply because if they delay their suit, they will give up their right to sue. It does not make sense to encourage people to sue before they have all the facts. We should ensure that we have a statute of limitations that makes sense.

I have fought against pay discrimination since my first day in Congress. Discrimination of any kind should never be allowed, and I intend to keep fighting against it.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act is common-sense legislation that should be enacted into law as we work to end discrimination at all levels.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2831, and I would encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2831, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007. Colleagues, I wish that I did not have to stand here today; I wish that we did not have to have this debate. However, in reversing decades of precedent and placing new limits on the ability of victims of pay discrimination to pursue their claims, the Supreme Court's May 29 decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear* makes our debate here today critically necessary to ensuring a better America for all of our citizens.

Some on the other side of the aisle have complained that this legislation will dismantle the statute of limitations established by the 1964 Civil Rights Act. They maintain that this legislation will allow an employee to sue for pay discrimination resulting from an alleged discriminatory act that might have occurred 5, 10, 20, or even 30 or more years earlier and that under H.R. 2831 a worker or retiree could seek damages against a company run by employees and executives that had nothing to do with the initial act of alleged discrimination that occurred dozens of years ago.

These arguments represent nothing more than an attempt to muddy the waters. The reality is that Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act does nothing to disturb the current law's 180-day charge-filing period and employees continue to be subject to these time limits. Instead, the bill merely clarifies the conduct that triggers the running of the 180-day clock. Under the legislation, if an employee wants to challenge discriminatory pay, he or she must file within 180 days of the discriminatory conduct, such as the payment of a discriminatory wage. If the employee waits longer than 180 days after the discriminatory conduct, the 180-day clock will run out and a charge will become untimely.

The fact of the matter is that pay discriminatory is often difficult to discover and takes place over many years. Many employers have policies explicitly forbidding employees from talking to one another about their pay. Workplace norms also discourage employees from asking each other about their pay. Additionally, discriminatory pay tends to have a cumulative effect—what may seem like a minor discrepancy at first builds up over time. By the time the discrimination is noticed, it would be too late to file a charge under the Supreme Court's ruling. These facts were undoubtedly the reason why a jury of her peers originally awarded Lilly Ledbetter more than \$3.5 million; finding "more likely than not" that sex discrimination during her 19-year career led to her being paid substantially less than her male counterparts.

By passing this legislation here today, Congress will be heeding Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's call to stand up and ensure that no American's income should be determined by race, sex, creed, color, or sexuality.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, as cosponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

This legislation corrects and clarifies a serious misinterpretation by the Supreme Court when it ruled earlier this year in the case of *Ledbetter v. Goodyear*.

In that 5–4 decision, the majority ruled that Lilly Ledbetter, the lone female supervisor at a tire plant in Gadsden, AL, did not file her lawsuit against Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. in the timely manner specified by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The court determined a victim of pay discrimination must file a charge within 180 days of the employer's decision to pay someone less for an unlawfully discriminatory reason, such as race, sex, religion, etc.

Prior to the Supreme Court's ruling, the widely accepted rule in employment discrimination law was that every discriminatory paycheck was a new violation that restarts the 180-day clock.

H.R. 2831 restores the law prior to the Supreme Court's *Ledbetter* decision, by clarifying that the clock for filing a discrimination charge starts when a discriminatory pay decision or practice is adopted, when a person becomes subject to the pay decision or practice, or when a person is affected by the pay decision or practice, including whenever she receives a discriminatory paycheck.

The Supreme Court must not be able to roll back workers' rights in one ruling. Congress must pass this legislation to ensure workers are protected and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2831.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, H.R. 2831. Although women have made great strides towards income equality in the workplace, a gap still exists. According to the Census Bureau, women continue to make 77 cents to every dollar that their male counterparts earn. No one knows this fact better than Lilly Ledbetter. She worked hard at a Goodyear tire plant for 19 years. Initially, Ms. Ledbetter was paid the same as her male colleagues but over time her salary did not continue to rise at the same rate as male colleagues. However, like many employees, she was unaware of the discrepancy for years. By

the time she discovered it, the Supreme Court said she was too late to receive justice, a finding that overturns 30 years of established case law.

The Supreme Court held, that the plaintiff must file suit within 180 days of the initial so called discrimination. This may seem like a reasonable amount of time, but for wage discrimination cases, this is often not feasible. Many employers forbid workers from discussing their salaries and employees are often not even aware that they have been discriminated against until after they leave their job. This finding stands in stark contrast with 30 years of case law, which has found that the 180 day "clock" starts anew with each discriminatory paycheck. This bill codifies by starting the clock for filing a discrimination charge starts when a discriminatory pay decision or practice is adopted, when a person becomes subject to the pay decision or practice, or when employees affected by the pay decision or practice, including whenever receive a discriminatory paycheck.

During her testimony in June at an Education and Labor Committee hearing, Lilly Ledbetter said:

What happened to me is not only an insult to my dignity, but it had real consequences for my ability to care for my family. Every paycheck I received, I got less than what I was entitled to under the law.

Sadly, Ms. Ledbetter's case is not unique, in fact from 2001–2006, some 40,000 wage discrimination cases were filed from workers, much like Lilly Ledbetter. This bill will finally give workers the "what they are entitled to under the law".

I thank Chairman MILLER and my colleagues for bringing this legislation to the floor so quickly.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2831, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007.

The recent Supreme Court ruling in the *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire* case turns the clock back on decades of progress. As a result of this ruling it is now even more difficult for employees to exercise their rights for equal pay and equal treatment as determined under the law.

This decision was based on a questionable technicality, not on the fact that Ms. Ledbetter was paid 20 percent less than even the least qualified of her male counterparts. Ms. Ledbetter did nothing wrong throughout the process. She toiled for 19 years and deserved equal pay and treatment by her employers.

For centuries, women, minorities, and many others have fought for equal rights and consideration under the law. Congress is being forced to invoke its constitutional powers to restore balance and justice for the sake of equality. Today we send a strong message that discrimination and injustice on the basis of gender is intolerable.

Simply said Madam Speaker, H.R. 2831 is not about turning back the clock on civil rights law; this legislation protects these hard-fought and hard-earned guarantees. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, women who work full time, earn, on average, only 77 cents for every dollar men earn. The figures are even worse for women of color. Clearly, discrimination is not a relic of the past.

I know that many, many Members of Congress recognize the importance of this legislation. I ask all of my colleagues to vote yes. I

hope that the President will stand for equality and justice by signing this important bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 579, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2272, 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2007

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2272) to invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF TEXAS

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hall of Texas moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2272, be instructed to:

(A) insist on the lower overall authorization level as set forth by the House in H.R. 2272; and

(B) insist on the language of subsection (a) of Section 203 of the House bill, relating to prioritization of early career grants to science and engineering researchers for the expansion of domestic energy production and use through coal-to-liquids technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer a straightforward motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2272, a bill to invest in innovation through research and development, and

to improve the competitiveness of the United States.

This motion to instruct the conferees simply insists that the House conferees support the House position. It does this in two important ways that I believe will make the conference report better and Members on both sides of the aisle proud to support it.

First, the motion to instruct encourages the conferees to insist on the overall House authorization level, which is considerably lower than the Senate authorization level. In fact, estimates put the bill as passed by the Senate at approximately \$40 billion higher than the total House authorization level.

Second, this motion to instruct insists that House conferees support the previously adopted House position with regard to giving priority to grants to expand domestic energy production through the use of coal-to-liquids. That type technology and advanced nuclear reprocessing should be used.

I believe this is an important section of the bill that will help to ensure that we are preparing our scientists and our engineers for the future of energy security.

Many Members of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, voted in favor of the authorization level and voted in favor of this program, including my good friend, the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee. I am encouraging Members to stand up for the House position on these two issues.

Before I explain the importance of the provision regarding grants to expand energy production, let me take a moment to compare the authorization level in the House bill with the authorization level in the Senate bill.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I strongly support an increase in funding for the agencies that perform scientific research in this country. Without these agencies, we would fall far behind the rest of the world in innovation.

Some of the greatest inventions of our time have come from the brilliant scientists of our country. To remain competitive as a Nation, we must encourage new ideas and educate new young minds, but we must also be mindful to exercise fiscal responsibility. The young minds we are educating should not be taught irresponsible spending habits. We have to lead by example.

The House bill contains substantial increases for the sciences very close to the President's request, and moves us closer to the goal the President has set out in the State of the Union Message calling for a doubling of the spending on the sciences.

The Senate bill includes a vast increase in spending that is approximately \$8 billion above the budget request by the administration for this year alone. I encourage my colleagues to work with me to increase spending on science in a responsible fashion.

As we move to conference on the competitiveness bill, I also want to encourage my colleagues to support the provision in the House bill urging researchers to invest time and to invest money into advancing coal-to-liquids technology and nuclear reprocessing.

There are, as my colleagues stated previously on the floor of this Chamber, several pieces to the energy puzzle. One very important piece continues to be the efficient and affordable research and development of this Nation's domestic energy resources. Twenty-seven percent of the world's recoverable coal reserves are in the United States and spread throughout our country, which would minimize supply disruptions in the event of a natural disaster or in the event of a terrorist attack.

We are currently importing around 60 percent of our oil supply, and that number is projected to grow unless we do something about it. As the Saudi Arabia of coal, if our Nation can economically produce liquid transportation fuel from coal, we can reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil and increase the security of this country.

We also need to better manage our nuclear energy resources. In the pursuit of expanding our nuclear fleet, we should encourage scientists and engineers early in their careers to focus on the development of abandoned nuclear reprocessing technologies. We need to invigorate our aging nuclear sector so this energy source continues to serve as a clean, affordable, domestic energy resource for our consumers.

The House may soon be taking up an energy package. To my knowledge, this energy package contains no language on coal-to-liquids and very little on nuclear energy. Given the fact that our Nation's continued growth and prosperity depend on affordable and reliable energy resources, I am disappointed that we are not promoting all options for Americans. This opportunity may be one of the few Members get to support our Nation's coal and our Nation's nuclear interests. We should take every opportunity to address citizens' concerns with rising energy prices. And that is why I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this provision on this date.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he has any further speakers?

If the gentleman from Texas does not have any further speakers, I believe that I have the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I just continue to reserve the balance of my time. I do want the right to close, and I have a speaker that is approaching at this time.

□ 1330

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, at this point, we have no further speakers, and

I would yield the floor to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, you have indulged me as long as I can ask you to, and so has this gentleman from way out in deep west Texas. I'm honored to be here with him, so I will go ahead and close.

As I wrap up here, I want to encourage the House Members to support the authorization level as it remains. It is as appropriate now as it was when the bill was passed overwhelmingly in the House.

And I also want to reiterate my frustration of America's continued dependence on foreign sources of energy and encourage my colleagues to explore domestic sources of energy.

For some reason, there's a war against energy from fossil fuels going right on down at this very time, this very day, and I'm not sure why. Anyone with just a little common sense is able to understand that in order to be less dependent on foreign sources of oil and to increase our national security, we need everything we can develop. We need conventional, renewable and alternative sources of energy. Our country at this time will not be able to continue to thrive and lead the world on renewable energy alone, so to punish the oil and gas industry and to not encourage alternative uses of coal and continued use of nuclear power is to ensure the United States will lose its place as a world leader.

Make no mistake, I support the continued development and increased use of renewable energy, but not at the expense of fossil fuels and clean nuclear energy.

Madam Speaker, the House is already on record supporting this language and this authorization level just 3 months ago. I can't think of a reason why it wouldn't be supported again today.

I urge my colleagues to vote to keep this House-passed language in the bill that will result from the conference committee. And, Madam Speaker, thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise to make a brief closing statement.

Madam Speaker, the issues raised by the gentleman from Texas have been solved to the satisfaction of a majority of the members of the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

# EIGHTMILE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 580, proceedings will now resume on the bill (H.R. 986) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Eightmile River in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Monday, July 30, 2007, 4 minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each control 2 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, the issue at hand today is not the 23 miles of wild and scenic river in what is called the Eightmile River. It is on the use of condemnation power to create it. It is sad in this situation that staff did not decide to work in a bipartisan way to try and come up with language accommodating everybody, instead, rejected in both the Rules and Resource Committees on straight party-line votes, simple and direct language that the Republicans submitted. We asked that it simply read that no Federal funds be used to condemn land to carry out the purpose of that act. Every Democrat, from the sponsor to the committee, said that was indeed their goal.

That is simple language in section B. It is short; it's direct; it's understandable to any citizen, any attorney, any judge. That's what we need.

Instead, the Democrats gave us a convoluted bit of double talk about zoning ordinances by some date in 2005, later on perhaps, willing sellers, all in the wrong section of the code, section C.

It is nice, but it is a loophole. Simply because if you read, not the bill, but the act, read the entire act, you'll find that all of the language that is presented in this section, in this bill comes after this sentence in the law which says, nothing contained in this section, that covers what we're talking about and what they're talking about, nothing contained in this section shall preclude the use of condemnation. This supersedes everything in their bill. All the gobbledygook they want to do, it supersedes it.

This is the language to which we object, and the Democrat bill does nothing to mitigate this power of condemnation.

I don't care if we're talking about an Eightmile River in Connecticut for Mr. COURTNEY or 8 miles of road in Detroit for Eminem. This is still the issue that is at hand. In the district where the State and local governments tried to take the home away from Suzette Kelo, we don't want it to be replicated again. This language has to be changed.

So all of us need to lose yourself in this language. Read it, for indeed our citizens will. The voters will. It is clear. This is what we need changed.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, the language in this bill is no different from other wild and scenic river bills that have passed both Democratic and Republican Congresses, including under the former committee chairman, the famed property rights defender, Richard Pombo.

To hear opponents tell it, this bill is a threat to private property with the Federal Government waiting in the wings to condemn land. In reality, nothing of the sort would happen, and that's because opponents of the bill have persistently refused to acknowledge the clear language of the legislation.

First of all, the bill prohibits condemnation under the authority of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Then the very next sentence states: "The authority of the Secretary to acquire lands for the purpose of this Act should be limited to the acquisition by donation or acquisition with the consent of the owner."

Therefore, I believe, Madam Speaker, this is an absolute, unambiguous blanket denial of condemnation authorities. We say it twice in the legislation. We don't need to say it three times.

My colleague, JOE COURTNEY, has done an outstanding job with this measure, which is supported by the entire Connecticut delegation, the Republican Governor of Connecticut, the State legislature and all of the affected local governments, and the Bush administration.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan measure.

I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PEARCE. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pearce moves to recommit the bill H.R. 986 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

(j) CLARIFICATION.—No Federal funds may be used to condemn land to carry out the purposes of this Act or the amendment made by subsection (b)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for his hard work on this issue. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee. We're good friends. And all three of us come from the West, where we are very familiar with public ownership of land.

One of the things that really concerns us most about the threat of condemnation and about the way that home owners, private property owners would be affected is shown in this chart that I have here. The management plan would put a cap on impervious services, and those services could not be paved. If the road to your house washes out, then you simply can't do it.

Now, there are all sorts of takings that the Federal Government can do, and this is one, where they simply won't allow you to fix your property up or fix the roads leading to your property.

□ 1345

So you would lose value because you could not own a house and sell a house that has a road leading to it that has washed out. You cannot add a room to your home; so feasibly we could say that we are limiting procreation. If you have another kid, you can't build a room in the back to accommodate them. You can't go build on your property if you have not already built there. You can't go in and build. The private land is impacted seriously.

But beyond that is there a real concern? Do we have a concern for the public taking of private lands and making it theirs? Are there examples in our history as a Nation where we maybe have extended the power of a Federal Government, a central government that is too strong, a central government that begins to overburden and outweigh and out muscle the citizens? If so, then it is imperative that we give voice to those citizens who have no other voice, who have been left out completely, who are going to be marginalized by these management plans.

I think that we do have a Federal Government that will extend too far, and I think that we have a concern here. Now, it is unfortunate that we have come to this point because the underlying bill, the one that says we would like to preserve a wild and scenic river, is one that there is almost no discussion about. The entire discussion is about private property rights, that constitutional right that gives us each our place to retreat to in the evening without the government's coming in and taking either part of its value or simply confiscating the whole thing.

Now, confiscation is a language that seems abrupt, that seems too harsh, that we really do not face that sort of circumstance today in this country. I would tell you that, as chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee last year, we heard testimony from the Franciscan Friars of Atonement in

New York. That group had fought the National Park Service for decades, saying don't take our land. But through eminent domain, the Federal Park Service had continued to put pressure. Again, it was the threat of what they could do that was used as the hammer.

So we find ourselves now with this bill, which the ranking member adequately points out that there is an underlying bill that contains language that nothing contained in this section shall preclude the use of condemnation. It is a process that has been used frequently.

I was recently in Shenandoah National Park, and you would think that Shenandoah is just a great location, and it is. But the underlying story is one that is told right now in the Visitors Center in Shenandoah, and it is about the confiscation, about moving, it seems to me, about 4,000 families out of their homes so that that could be a big park area. We did not want those inconvenient people living there; so we simply moved them out for their own good. We moved them to much better places regardless if they wanted to move or not.

In my own State of New Mexico, the White Sands Missile Range exists there. It is 100 miles north and south and it is 40 miles east and west, 100 miles by 40 miles, and almost all of that land was taken by condemnation.

Condemnation occurs when a too strong central Federal Government just wants to go ahead and move. Forget those pesky citizens.

The Supreme Court recently in the Kelo decision said that governments can, in fact, take private property and redistribute it to another private firm. That is what is at stake both left and right. Both agreed in this circumstance. Liberal and conservative, Democrats and Republicans, said the Kelo decision was one of the most atrocious in taking private property rights away from people.

Madam Speaker, I would simply point out that private property rights are the foundation of our rights. I would urge all Members to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I have got a feeling that people in this Chamber have heard more about the Eightmile River in Connecticut than they probably ever wanted to. But I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and Chairman RAHALL, intelligent, thoughtful people who understand the 10 years of hard work that has taken place in the communities of Salem, Lyme and East Haddam, Connecticut, to get to this day is worth proceeding and moving forward.

There are 168 rivers in this country that have been designated as Wild and Scenic, and the Federal Government has not swept in and seized property as part of this program. This is a program which is aimed at preserving water quality and species, and it is very clear in the act that the government will waive any powers of condemnation if they are satisfied that there are zoning and wetland regulations in place which will accomplish those goals. And that is exactly the situation here.

These three towns have wetland regulations which have been on the books before the application for Wild and Scenic status ever took place which the Parks Department checked off on its box as adequate to achieve the goals of this program, and thus the statute specifically states that the condemnation powers shall not apply to this property.

When this issue came up 3 weeks ago, newspapers back home looked at it and just said the claims of the other side are just not true. And that is why the Republican Governor of the State of Connecticut, Jodi Rell; the Republican First Selectman of the Town of Lyme; the Republican First Selectman of the Town of Salem; and the Democratic First Selectman, who's a pretty good guy too, have all come out in support of this legislation because it has been a grassroots community effort, bipartisan, property owners and public officials, to make the Eightmile River part of the family of rivers in this country which have been identified as worth preserving for our children and our grandchildren.

The bill that was drafted by non-partisan staff follows the basic legislative format that this Congress has followed in the past for Wild and Scenic status. In fact, the prior Congress which was controlled by the Republicans, the 109th Congress, proceeded on a river designation in the State of New Jersey without any of the language which is included in the motion to recommit. If it was such a big deal, why didn't the other side, when they were in control, actually adopt that language?

I think, frankly, folks, we are talking about politics here and not policy. And again I want to thank Mr. GRIJALVA for his strong support.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, as I hear the colleagues on the other side raising the specter of massive condemnation on the part of the Federal Government, I believe that it is more of a scare tactic to divert attention, I think, about what is good in this bill because there are really no substantive grounds in which to oppose it.

Twice in the legislation it is reaffirmed that condemnation is not part of the process, that there must be willing consent on the part of property owners. There is no real problem in that. The Bush administration understands it, the Republican Governor of



Connecticut understands this, the affected local communities understand this.

In my opinion, I think the motivation for opposition has to do with the audacity of the gentleman from Connecticut to run for office, replace an incumbent and his predecessor, and then the audacity of the voters of that district to go ahead and elect the gentleman, the sponsor of this legislation.

It is a consensus bill. It has good support. Rather than dealing with the messenger, as we are doing today in a political basis, let's deal with the content, the substance, and the support of this legislation. And I would urge rejection of the motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 986, if ordered; passage of H.R. 2831; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 581; adoption of House Resolution 581, if ordered; the motion to instruct on H.R. 2272; and motions to suspend the rules with respect to H.R. 176, H.R. 957, and H.R. 2722.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 225, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 766]

YEAS—200

Aderholt	Cantor	Gillibrand
Akin	Capito	Gillmor
Alexander	Carter	Gingrey
Altmire	Castle	Gohmert
Bachmann	Chabot	Goode
Bachus	Coble	Goodlatte
Baker	Conaway	Granger
Barrett (SC)	Crenshaw	Graves
Barrow	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Bartlett (MD)	Culberson	Hastert
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Biggert	Davis, David	Hayes
Blibray	Davis, Tom	Heller
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Herger
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Boehner	Doolittle	Hulshof
Bonner	Drake	Hunter
Bono	Dreier	Inglis (SC)
Boozman	Duncan	Issa
Boren	Emerson	Jindal
Boustany	English (PA)	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Everett	Jones (NC)
Broun (GA)	Fallin	Jordan
Brown (SC)	Feeney	Keller
Brown-Waite,	Ferguson	King (IA)
Ginny	Flake	King (NY)
Buchanan	Forbes	Kingston
Burgess	Fortenberry	Kline (MN)
Burton (IN)	Fossella	Knollenberg
Buyer	Fox	Kuhl (NY)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Camp (MI)	Gallely	Lampson
Campbell (CA)	Garrett (NJ)	Latham
Cannon	Gerlach	LaTourette

Lewis (CA)	Paul
Lewis (KY)	Pearce
Linder	Pence
LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)
Lucas	Peterson (PA)
Lungren, Daniel	Petri
E.	Pickering
Mack	Pitts
Manzullo	Platts
Marchant	Poe
Marshall	Porter
Matheson	Price (GA)
McCarthy (CA)	Pryce (OH)
McCauley (TX)	Putnam
McCotter	Radanovich
McCrery	Ramstad
McHenry	Regula
McHugh	Rehberg
McKeon	Reichert
McMorris	Renzi
Rodgers	Reynolds
McNerney	Rogers (AL)
Mica	Rogers (KY)
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen
Moran (KS)	Roskam
Murphy, Tim	Royce
Musgrave	Ryan (WI)
Myrick	Sali
Neugebauer	Saxton
Nunes	Schmidt

NAYS—225

Abercrombie	Etheridge	McCollum (MN)
Ackerman	Farr	McDermott
Allen	Fattah	McGovern
Andrews	Filner	McIntyre
Arcuri	Frank (MA)	McNulty
Baca	Frelinghuysen	Meek (FL)
Baird	Giffords	Meeks (NY)
Baldwin	Gonzalez	Melancon
Bean	Gordon	Michaud
Becerra	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Berkley	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Berman	Grijalva	Mitchell
Berry	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Bishop (GA)	Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)
Bishop (NY)	Hare	Moore (WI)
Blumenauer	Harman	Moran (VA)
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)
Boucher	Hereth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick
Boyd (FL)	Higgins	Murtha
Boyd (KS)	Hill	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Napolitano
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Neal (MA)
Brown, Corrine	Hirono	Oberstar
Butterfield	Hodes	Obey
Capps	Holden	Olver
Capuano	Holt	Ortiz
Cardoza	Honda	Pallone
Carnahan	Hooley	Pascarell
Carney	Hoyer	Pastor
Carson	Inslee	Payne
Castor	Israel	Perlmutter
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Cleaver	(TX)	Rahall
Clyburn	Jefferson	Rangel
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Cooper	Jones (OH)	Ross
Costa	Kagen	Rothman
Costello	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cramer	Kennedy	Rush
Crowley	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Kilpatrick	Salazar
Cummings	Kind	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	Kirk	T.
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Davis, Lincoln	Langevin	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lantos	Schiff
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
DeLauro	Lee	Scott (VA)
Dicks	Levin	Serrano
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sestak
Doggett	Lipinski	Shays
Donnelly	Loebach	Shea-Porter
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
Edwards	Lowey	Shuler
Ehlers	Lynch	Sires
Ellison	Mahoney (FL)	Skelton
Ellsworth	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
Emanuel	Markey	Smith (WA)
Engel	Matsui	Snyder
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Solis

Space	Towns	Watt
Spratt	Udall (CO)	Waxman
Stark	Udall (NM)	Weiner
Stupak	Van Hollen	Welch (VT)
Sutton	Velazquez	Wexler
Tanner	Visclosky	Whitfield
Tauscher	Walz (MN)	Wilson (OH)
Taylor	Wasserman	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Schultz	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Waters	Wynn
Tierney	Watson	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Clarke	Gilchrest	Tancred.
Cole (OK)	Johnson, Sam	
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1425

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SOLIS and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Messrs. KAGEN, PRICE of North Carolina, TIERNEY, UDALL of Colorado, DELAHUNT, RUSH, GORDON, and RANGEL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. GILLIBRAND and Messrs. HAYES, DOOLITTLE, SOUDER, BOREN, INGLIS of South Carolina and WALBERG changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 766, on the motion to recommit H.R. 986, Eightmile Wild and Scenic River Act, with instructions. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises Members that the Chair will endeavor to closely adhere to the announced time for votes. Members' cooperation during this very busy week will be much appreciated.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 172, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 767]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie	Berry	Butterfield
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Altmire	Blackburn	Cardoza
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Arcuri	Bono	Carney
Baca	Boren	Carson
Baird	Boswell	Castle
Baldwin	Boucher	Castor
Barrow	Boyd (FL)	Chandler
Bean	Boyda (KS)	Clay
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Berkley	Braley (IA)	Clyburn
Berman	Brown, Corrine	Cohen

Costa	Johnson (GA)	Reichert	Hobson	McKeon	Rohrabacher	Gillibrand	Marshall	Sarbanes
Cramer	Johnson (IL)	Reyes	Hoekstra	McMorris	Roskam	Gonzalez	Matheson	Schakowsky
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez	Hulshof	Rodgers	Royce	Gordon	Matsui	Schiff
Cuellar	Jones (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen	Hunter	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Cummings	Kagen	Ross	Issa	Miller (FL)	Sali	Green, Gene	McCollum (MN)	Scott (GA)
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Rothman	Jindal	Miller (MI)	Schmidt	Grijalva	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Royal-Allard	Jones (NC)	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner	Gutierrez	McGovern	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger	Jordan	Moran (KS)	Sessions	Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Sestak
Davis, Lincoln	Kildee	Rush	Keller	Murphy, Tim	Shadegg	Hare	McNerney	Shays
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Ryan (OH)	King (IA)	Musgrave	Shimkus	Harman	McNulty	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Kind	Salazar	King (NY)	Myrick	Shuster	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sherman
DeLaunt	Kirk	Sánchez, Linda	Kingston	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)	Herseeth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	T.	Kline (MN)	Nunes	Smith (TX)	Higgins	Melancon	Sires
Dent	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta	Knollenberg	Paul	Souder	Hill	Michaud	Skelton
Dicks	Lampson	Sarbanes	Kuhl (NY)	Pearce	Stearns	Hinchey	Miller (NC)	Slaughter
Dingell	Langevin	Saxton	Lamborn	Pence	Terry	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Lantos	Schakowsky	Latham	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry	Hirono	Mitchell	Snyder
Donnelly	Larsen (WA)	Schiff	LaTourette	Pickering	Tiahrt	Hodes	Mollohan	
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Lee	Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Turner	Holden	Moore (KS)	Solis
Edwards	Dicks	Lee	Lewis (KY)	Platts	Tiberi	Holt	Moore (WI)	Space
Ehlers	Dingell	Levin	Linder	Poe	Turner	Honda	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Ellison	Doggett	Lewis (GA)	LoBiondo	Porter	Walberg	Hooley	Murphy (CT)	Stark
Ellsworth	Donnelly	Lipinski	Lucas	Price (GA)	Walden (OR)	Hoyer	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak
Emanuel	Doyle	Loeb sack	Lun gren, Daniel	Price (OH)	Walsh (NY)	Israel	Murtha	Sutton
Engel	Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe	E.	Putnam	Wamp	Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Tanner
English (PA)	Ehlers	Lowey	Shea-Porter	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Tauscher
Eshoo	Ellison	Lynch	Sherman	Ramstad	Weller	(TX)	Neal (MA)	Taylor
Etheridge	Ellsworth	Mahoney (FL)	Shuler	Regula	Westmoreland	Jefferson	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Simpson	Rehberg	Wicker	Johnson (GA)	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Engel	Markey	Sires	Renzi	Wilson (NM)	Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Tierney
Ferguson	English (PA)	Marshall	Skelton	Reynolds	Wilson (SC)	Jones (OH)	Ortiz	Towns
Filner	Eshoo	Matheson	Slaughter	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)	Kagen	Pallone	Udall (CO)
Fortenberry	Etheridge	Matsui	Smith (NJ)	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)	Kanjorski	Pascrell	Udall (NM)
Frank (MA)	Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)	McHenry		Kaptur	Pastor	Van Hollen
Frelinghuysen	Fattah	McCollum (MN)	Snyder	McHugh		Kennedy	Payne	Velázquez
Gerlach	Ferguson	McDermott	Solis			Kildee	Pelosi	Visclosky
Giffords	Filner	McGovern	Space	Clarke	Johnson, Sam	Kilpatrick	Perlmutter	Walz (MN)
Gillibrand	Fortenberry	McIntyre	Spratt	Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Kind	Peterson (MN)	Wasserman
Gonzalez	Frank (MA)	McNerney	Stark	Gilchrest	Sullivan	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy	Schultz
Gordon	Frelinghuysen	McNulty	Stupak			Kucinich	Price (NC)	
Green, Al	Gerlach	Meek (FL)	Sutton			Langevin	Rahall	Waters
Green, Gene	Giffords	Meeks (NY)	Tanner			Lantos	Rangel	Watson
Grijalva	Gillibrand	Melancon	Tauscher			Larsen (WA)	Reyes	Watt
Gutierrez	Gordon	Michaud	Taylor			Larson (CT)	Rodriguez	Waxman
Hall (NY)	Green, Al	Miller (NC)	Thompson (CA)			Lee	Ross	Weiner
Hare	Green, Gene	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)			Levin	Rothman	Welch (VT)
Harman	Grijalva	Mitchell	Tierney			Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard	Wexler
Hastings (FL)	Gutierrez	Mollohan	Towns			Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Wilson (OH)
Herseeth Sandlin	Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)	Udall (CO)			Loeb sack	Rush	Woolsey
Higgins	Hare	Moran (VA)	Udall (NM)			Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (OH)	Wu
Hill	Harman	Murphy (CT)	Upton			Lowey	Salazar	Wynn
Hinche y	Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Van Hollen			Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Yarmuth
Hinojosa	Herseeth Sandlin	Murtha	Velázquez			Maloney (NY)	T.	Young (AK)
Hirono	Higgins	Nadler	Visclosky				Sanchez, Loretta	
Hodes	Hill	Napolitano	Walz (MN)					
Holden	Hinche y	Neal (MA)	Wasserman					
Holt	Hinojosa	Oberstar	Schultz					
Honda	Hirono	Obey	Waters					
Hooley	Hodes	Olver	Watson					
Hoyer	Holden	Ortiz	Watt					
Inglis (SC)	Holt	Pallone	Waxman					
Insee	Honda	Pascrell	Weiner					
Israel	Hooley	Pastor	Welch (VT)					
Jackson (IL)	Hoyer	Payne	Wexler					
Jackson-Lee	Inglis (SC)	Perlmutter	Whitfield					
(TX)	Insee	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (OH)					
Jefferson	Israel	Petri	Wolf					
	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy	Woolsey					
	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)	Wu					
	(TX)	Rahall	Wynn					
	Jefferson	Rangel	Yarmuth					

</

McMorris  
Rodgers  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich

Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Saxton  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—9

Blackburn  
Clarke  
Davis, Jo Ann

Gilchrest  
Inslie  
Johnson, Sam

LaHood  
Mica  
Tancred

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1440

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3161, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 581, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 197, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 769]

## YEAS—228

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)

Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Chandler  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar

Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah

Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herse  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb

Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herse  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb

## NAYS—197

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw

Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallagher  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Hall (TX)  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling

Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slack  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush

Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula

Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Saxton  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)

## NOT VOTING—7

Clarke  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Gilchrest

Johnson, Sam  
LaHood  
Sullivan

Tancred

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1447

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises Members that, pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending series of questions also will include the proceedings de novo on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the minimum time for electronic voting will be 5 minutes.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2272, 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2007

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 2272 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 167, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 770]

## YEAS—258

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander

Altmire  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baker

Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)

Bean  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Costa  
Costello  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gillmor

Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseht Sandlin  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Ingilis (SC)  
Issa  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (IL)  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar

#### NAYS—167

Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer

Ortiz  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Hinojosa  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Holt  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Space  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Towns  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Watt  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett

Ellison  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holt  
Mitchell  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Obey  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Perlmutter  
Price (NC)  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush

#### NOT VOTING—7

Johnson, Sam  
LaHood  
Smith (NJ)

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1454

Mr. SPRATT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SHIRLEY A. CHISHOLM UNITED STATES-CARIBBEAN EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 176, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 176, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 55, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 771]  
YEAS—371  
Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Cannon  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castle  
Castor  
Chandler  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle

Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCauley (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires

Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)

Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—55

Akin  
Barrett (SC)  
Bilbray  
Blackburn  
Boehner  
Broun (GA)  
Burgess  
Campbell (CA)  
Cantor  
Carter  
Chabot  
Coble  
Conaway  
Culberson  
Davis, David  
Deal (GA)  
Doolittle  
Duncan  
Feeney

Flake  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gingrey  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Hastert  
Hensarling  
Hoekstra  
Issa  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)  
Lamborn  
Manzullo  
McHenry  
McKeon

Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Musgrave  
Neugebauer  
Paul  
Pence  
Poe  
Rohrabacher  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Walberg  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Westmoreland

## NOT VOTING—6

Clarke  
Davis, Jo Ann

Gilchrest  
Johnson, Sam

LaHood  
Tancred

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1501

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to authorize the establishment of educational exchange and development programs for member countries of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM).”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996 AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 957, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 957, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 11, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 772]

## YEAS—415

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)

Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee

Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jindal  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)

Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires

Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walden (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—11

Abercrombie  
Bartlett (MD)  
Blumenauer  
Ellison

Flake  
Hinchey  
Jones (NC)  
Kucinich

McDermott  
Paul  
Stark

## NOT VOTING—6

Clarke  
Davis, Jo Ann

Gilchrest  
Johnson, Sam

LaHood  
Tancred

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1508

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# INTEGRATED DEEPWATER PROGRAM REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2722, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2722, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 773]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hulshof
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Hunter
Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Inglis (SC)
Akin	Davis (KY)	Inslie
Alexander	Davis, David	Israel
Allen	Davis, Lincoln	Issa
Altmire	Davis, Tom	Jackson (IL)
Andrews	Deal (GA)	Jackson-Lee
Arcuri	DeFazio	(TX)
Baca	DeGette	Jefferson
Bachmann	Delahunt	Jindal
Bachus	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Baird	Dent	Johnson (IL)
Baker	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, E. B.
Baldwin	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)
Barrett (SC)	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Barrow	Dingell	Jordan
Bartlett (MD)	Doggett	Kagen
Barton (TX)	Donnelly	Kanjorski
Bean	Doolittle	Kaptur
Becerra	Doyle	Keller
Berkley	Drake	Kennedy
Berman	Dreier	Kildee
Berry	Duncan	Kilpatrick
Biggert	Edwards	Kind
Bilbray	Ehlers	King (IA)
Billirakis	Ellison	King (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Ellsworth	Kingston
Bishop (NY)	Emanuel	Kirk
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Klein (FL)
Blackburn	Engel	Kline (MN)
Blumenauer	English (PA)	Knollenberg
Blunt	Eshoo	Kucinich
Boehner	Etheridge	Kuhl (NY)
Bonner	Everett	Lamborn
Bono	Fallin	Lampson
Boozman	Farr	Langevin
Boren	Fattah	Lantos
Boswell	Ferguson	Larsen (WA)
Boucher	Filner	Larson (CT)
Boustany	Flake	Latham
Boyd (FL)	Forbes	LaTourette
Boyd (KS)	Fortenberry	Lee
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Levin
Brady (TX)	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Braley (IA)	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (KY)
Brown (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Brown, Corrine	Gallely	Lipinski
Brown-Waite,	Garrett (NJ)	LoBiondo
Ginny	Gerlach	Loebsack
Buchanan	Giffords	Lofgren, Zoe
Burgess	Gilchrest	Lowey
Burton (IN)	Gillibrand	Lucas
Butterfield	Gillmor	Lungren, Daniel
Buyer	Gingrey	E.
Calvert	Gohmert	Lynch
Camp (MI)	Gonzalez	Mack
Campbell (CA)	Goode	Mahoney (FL)
Cannon	Goodlatte	Maloney (NY)
Cantor	Gordon	Manzullo
Capito	Granger	Marchant
Capps	Graves	Markey
Capuano	Green, Al	Marshall
Cardoza	Green, Gene	Matheson
Carnahan	Grijalva	Matsui
Carney	Gutierrez	McCarthy (CA)
Carson	Hall (NY)	McCarthy (NY)
Carter	Hall (TX)	McCaul (TX)
Castle	Hare	McCollum (MN)
Castor	Harman	McCotter
Chabot	Hastert	McCrery
Chandler	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McGovern
Cleaver	Hayes	McHenry
Clyburn	Heller	McHugh
Coble	Hensarling	McIntyre
Cohen	Herger	McKeon
Cole (OK)	Herseeth Sandlin	McMorris
Conaway	Higgins	Rodgers
Conyers	Hill	McNerney
Cooper	Hinchey	McNulty
Costa	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Costello	Hirono	Meeks (NY)
Courtney	Hobson	Melancon
Cramer	Hodes	Mica
Crenshaw	Hoekstra	Michaud
Crowley	Holden	Miller (FL)
Cubin	Holt	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Honda	Miller (NC)
Culberson	Hookey	Miller, Gary
Cummings	Hoyer	Miller, George

Mitchell	Rodriguez	Stark
Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Stearns
Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Stupak
Moore (WI)	Rogers (MI)	Sullivan
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Sutton
Moran (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Murphy (CT)	Roskam	Tauscher
Murphy, Patrick	Ross	Taylor
Murphy, Tim	Rothman	Terry
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Musgrave	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Myrick	Ruppersberger	Thornberry
Nadler	Rush	Tiahrt
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tiberi
Neal (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Tierney
Neugebauer	Salazar	Towns
Nunes	Sali	Turner
Oberstar	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (CO)
Obey	T.	Udall (NM)
Oliver	Sanchez, Loretta	Upton
Ortiz	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Pallone	Saxton	Velázquez
Pascarell	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Pastor	Schiff	Walberg
Paul	Schmidt	Walden (OR)
Payne	Schwartz	Walsh (NY)
Pearce	Scott (GA)	Walz (MN)
Pence	Scott (VA)	Wamp
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Wasserman
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Schultz
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Waters
Petri	Sestak	Watson
Pickering	Shadegg	Watt
Pitts	Shays	Waxman
Platts	Shea-Porter	Weiner
Poe	Sherman	Welch (VT)
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Weldon (FL)
Porter	Shuler	Weller
Price (GA)	Shuster	Westmoreland
Price (NC)	Simpson	Wexler
Pryce (OH)	Sires	Whitfield
Putnam	Skelton	Wicker
Radanovich	Slaughter	Wilson (NM)
Rahall	Smith (NE)	Wilson (OH)
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Regula	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Rehberg	Snyder	Wu
Reichert	Solis	Wynn
Renzi	Souder	Yarmuth
Reyes	Space	Young (AK)
Reynolds	Spratt	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Clarke	Feeney	LaHood
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1514

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 210, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 774]

YEAS—214

Abercrombie	Hall (NY)	Nadler
Ackerman	Hare	Napolitano
Allen	Harman	Neal (MA)
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Arcuri	Herseeth Sandlin	Obey
Baca	Higgins	Oliver
Baird	Hill	Ortiz
Baldwin	Hinchey	Pallone
Barrow	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Bean	Hirono	Pastor
Becerra	Hodes	Paul
Berkley	Holden	Payne
Berman	Holt	Perlmutter
Berry	Honda	Pitts
Bishop (GA)	Hookey	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Rahall
Blumenauer	Inslie	Rangel
Boswell	Israel	Reichert
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Boyd (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Boyd (KS)	(TX)	Ross
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Rothman
Brady (TX)	Jindal	Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rush
Brown (SC)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Salazar
Brown-Waite,	Kanjorski	Sánchez, Linda
Ginny	Kaptur	T.
Buchanan	Keller	Sarbanes
Burgess	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Burton (IN)	Kildee	Schiff
Butterfield	Kilpatrick	Schwartz
Buyer	Kind	Scott (GA)
Calvert	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)
Camp (MI)	Kucinich	Serrano
Campbell (CA)	Lampson	Sestak
Cannon	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Cantor	Lantos	Sherman
Capito	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Capps	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Capuano	Lee	Levin
Cardoza	Levin	Slaughter
Carnahan	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Carney	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Carson	Lipinski	Souder
Carter	Loebsack	Spratt
Castle	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Castor	Lowey	Sutton
Chabot	Lynch	Tauscher
Chandler	Maloney (NY)	Taylor
Clay	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Cleaver	Matheson	Thornberry
Clyburn	Matsui	Tierney
Coble	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Cohen	McCollum (MN)	Van Hollen
Cole (OK)	McDermott	Velázquez
Conaway	McGovern	Visclosky
Conyers	McIntyre	Wasserman
Cooper	McNerney	Schultz
Costa	McNulty	Waters
Costello	Meek (FL)	Watson
Courtney	Meeks (NY)	Watt
Cramer	Melancon	Waxman
Crenshaw	Michaud	Weiner
Crowley	Miller (NC)	Welch (VT)
Cubin	Miller, George	Wexler
Cuellar	Mollohan	Wilson (OH)
Culberson	Moore (KS)	Woolsey
Cummings	Moore (WI)	Wu
	Moran (VA)	Wynn
	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
	Murphy, Patrick	
	Murtha	

NAYS—210

Aderholt	Boustany	Cubin
Akin	Brady (TX)	Cuellar
Alexander	Broun (GA)	Culberson
Altmire	Brown (SC)	Davis (KY)
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Davis, David
Bachus	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Baker	Buchanan	Deal (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	DeFazio
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	Dent
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, L.
Biggert	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bilbray	Camp (MI)	Donnelly
Billirakis	Campbell (CA)	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Drake
Blackburn	Capito	Dreier
Blunt	Carney	Duncan
Boehner	Carter	Ehlers
Bonner	Chabot	Ellsworth
Bono	Cole (OK)	Emerson
Boozman	Conaway	English (PA)
Boren	Crenshaw	Etheridge



Everett	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Fallin	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Ferguson	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
Flake	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam
Forbes	E.	Royce
Fortenberry	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Fossella	Mahoney (FL)	Sali
Fox	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Saxton
Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Schmidt
Gallegly	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Garrett (NJ)	McCaul (TX)	Sessions
Gerlach	McCotter	Shadegg
Giffords	McCrery	Shays
Gilchrest	McHenry	Shimkus
Gillmor	McHugh	Shuler
Gingrey	McKeon	Shuster
Gohmert	McMorris	Simpson
Goode	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Goodlatte	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Granger	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Graves	Miller (MI)	Souder
Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary	Space
Hastert	Mitchell	Stearns
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Stupak
Hayes	Murphy, Tim	Sullivan
Heller	Musgrave	Tanner
Hensarling	Myrick	Terry
Herger	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)
Hobson	Nunes	Tiahrt
Hoekstra	Pearce	Tiberi
Hulshof	Pence	Turner
Hunter	Peterson (MN)	Udall (CO)
Inglis (SC)	Peterson (PA)	Udall (NM)
Issa	Petri	Upton
Jones (NC)	Pickering	Walberg
Jordan	Platts	Walden (OR)
Kagen	Poe	Walsh (NY)
King (IA)	Porter	Walz (MN)
King (NY)	Price (GA)	Wamp
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Kirk	Putnam	Weller
Kline (MN)	Radanovich	Westmoreland
Knollenberg	Ramstad	Whitfield
Kuhl (NY)	Regula	Wicker
Lamborn	Rehberg	Wilson (NM)
Latham	Renzi	Wilson (SC)
LaTourette	Reynolds	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—8

Clarke	Feeney	Pomeroy
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1522

Mr. DOOLITTLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HOLT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GOHMERT changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEINER. On rollcall 765, H.R. 2347, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, during the period of consideration of that bill Congressman WEXLER and I were away from the floor, organizing efforts to stop the wrong-headed arms sale to Saudi Arabia.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor, and believe we need to keep on sanctioning Iran.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, I, too, would like to be recognized as just expressing my support for H.R. 2347.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2272, 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Gordon, Lipinski, Baird, Wu, Lampson, Udall of Colorado, Ms. Giffords, Messrs. McNerney, Hall of Texas, Sensenbrenner, Ehlers, Mrs. Biggert, Messrs. Feeney, and Gingrey.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of Division C of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. George Miller of California, Holt, and McKeon.

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3161, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

## AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 581 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3161.

□ 1524

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3161) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. BECERRA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to present to the House for fiscal year 2008 the appropriations bill For Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies. I want to say "thank you" to Chairman DAVID OBEY

for his dedication and leadership. It has been a very busy 7 months, and we have been fortunate to have Chairman OBEY at the helm. A special "thank you" to my colleague, Congressman KINGSTON. It has been a pleasure to partner with him on this subcommittee, and I believe that we have accomplished a lot together. We are working to accomplish quite a lot today, with quite a wide-ranging portfolio.

This appropriation covers many subjects. Our top priority has always been to move with a clear purpose and direction towards several key goals: strengthening rural America, protecting public health, improving nutrition for more Americans, transforming our energy future, supporting conservation, investing in research, and, finally, enhancing oversight.

It begins with our fiscal year 2008 mark providing total discretionary resources of \$18.8 billion, \$1 billion, or 5.7 percent, above 2007, and \$987.4 million, or 5.5 percent, above the budget request. A full 95 percent of the increase above the budget request, or \$940 million, is used to restore funding that was either eliminated or cut in the President's budget.

Our first goal is strengthening rural America. Community development is a key link to rebuilding rural America, preserving infrastructure, building new opportunities, and confronting a tremendous gap when it comes to educational and medical resources. To help close that gap, the bill provides \$52.8 million. That would double the broadband grant program which the President's budget request had eliminated. It provides \$10 million more than the President requested for distance learning and telemedicine grants and includes \$728.8 million to support community facilities, water and waste disposal systems, and business grants; \$31.2 million for community facilities; \$56.8 million for business and industry; and \$70.3 million for waste and waste disposal programs.

Clean water. Rural communities face tens of billions of dollars in costs for safe drinking water and wastewater treatment systems. To begin addressing these needs, the bill provides \$500 million for rural water and waste disposal grants and \$1 billion for water and waste direct loans.

In housing, the community held a special hearing to discuss economic conditions in rural America with the USDA's Economic Research Service. A recent ERS report found that 302 of America's non-metro counties are "housing stressed." That is why we are making significant investments in rural housing, including \$212.2 million to fund \$5.1 billion in affordable loans to providing housing to low-income and moderate-income families in rural areas, providing approximately 38,000 single family home ownership opportunities.

The President's budget eliminated direct loans and shifted funding to guaranteed loans with a 1 percent increase

in fees, making these loans more expensive and less accessible for low-income families.

Protecting public health was another of our priorities. The bill provides \$1.7 billion for the Food and Drug Administration. That is \$128.5 million over 2007 and \$62 million over the budget request; in addition, \$7 million in the manager's amendment in order for us to be able to inspect produce coming in from foreign countries.

This is what the committee hopes will be the first step in the fundamental transformation and the regulation of food safety at FDA.

□ 1530

The committee directs the FDA to submit a plan to begin changing its approach to food safety when it submits the fiscal year 2009 budget, giving the committee time to review the plan before the funds to implement it become available on July 1, 2008.

We can help with additional resources at FDA, but there also needs to be a corresponding commitment from management to perform its duties.

When our pets began to die from contaminated pet food that originated in China, the news forced us to take a hard look at entire food safety systems abroad. Our renewed attention revealed inadequate protection and an increasingly global food supply system. The budget includes an additional \$7 million, as I said, for FDA inspection of FDA imports. In addition, we address vacancies in Federal meat inspector positions. The bill fully funds the requested amount for the food safety and inspection service at \$930 million.

The bill also includes key language preventing the FDA from granting waivers of conflict of interest rules to voting members of the FDA advisory committee, and preventing USDA from establishing or implementing a rule allowing poultry products from China into the United States. The Chinese and others must be aware that trade cannot trump public health and that their regulations need to be strengthened to be considered an adequate trading partner.

Another of our top priorities is improving nutrition. For many long years we have failed to meet our obligations, failed to act, while too many Americans have gone without adequate healthy food. One in eight families with a toddler, an infant, in the United States is "food insecure"; that means that they are hungry. One in eight families with an infant.

Forty percent of children in rural America are dependent upon food stamps. The progress we made on this issue with the farm bill last week represents real change, and this bill includes \$39.8 billion for the Food Stamp program to meet increased participation and ensuring rising food prices do not diminish families' purchasing power.

The bill also provides record funding for two fundamental food security pro-

grams which serve our country's most vulnerable population, the supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children, WIC, and the Commodities Supplemental Food Program, CSFP. These efforts go hand in hand with ongoing initiatives, including \$957.7 million for nutrition programs to confront our Nation's obesity crisis, instilling better eating habits in our children, giving them the tools and the choices to avoid diabetes and other dangerous health conditions. That includes \$68.5 million for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, \$26 million to expand the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable and Simplified Summer Food Programs to all States, and \$10 million for specialty crops. What are specialty crops? They are related to healthy diets in this Nation; fruits and vegetables that are farmed in my part of the country, in the mid-Atlantic States, in California, crops that are so crucial nationwide from New England to the west coast.

Our work continues with other chief goals. Energy independence. This bill makes investments across the spectrum to grow our economy, create new jobs, lower energy prices and address global warming. It promotes renewable energy and moves us down the path to energy independence, strengthening bioenergy and renewable energy research funded at \$1.2 billion, including loans and grants in rural areas. The conservation and stewardship of our lands will affect our children for years to come.

This bill restores many of the programs slated for elimination in the President's request, including the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, the Wildlife Habitat Program, and watershed rehabilitation, and provides \$979.4 million to continue assistance to landowners for conservation efforts on private lands.

We also have an obligation to maintain agriculture's critical place at the forefront of groundbreaking research, maintaining our edge in crop development, competitiveness, trade, nutrition, food safety and even homeland security.

The bill increases funds for research and education through USDA's Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and the Agricultural Research Service.

Finally, enhanced oversight. The committee is concerned about waste, fraud and abuse in key programs and has included language requested by the administration to allow the Risk Management Agency to use up \$11.2 million in mandatory crop insurance funds to strengthen its ability to oversee the program by maintaining and upgrading IT systems and other methods of detecting dubious claims.

In closing, I think we should be excited about this bill, the goals that we set out to accomplish: strengthening rural America, protecting our public health, improving nutrition for more Americans, transforming our energy

future, supporting conservation, investing in research, and finally, enhancing oversight.

Most importantly, I believe it brings us back to our Nation's most fundamental principles; the strength of our communities. We have an obligation to get these things right. Let us assume that responsibility today, Mr. Chairman, and I'm pleased to submit this bill and I urge favorable consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to, first of all, start off by complimenting the Chair of the committee. We have had a number of hearings this year. We've had a lot of great oversight opportunities. I look forward to more. We've thoroughly reviewed this bill, and there's many things that we found agreement on. There are some things that we're going to have debate on today and things that we'll continue to debate as the bill goes through the process, but I want to commend Ms. DELAURO for a bill well put together. Also, I want to thank her staff, Martha Foley, Leslie Barrack, Diem-Lihn Jones, Adrienne Simmonson, Kelly Wade and Brian Ronholm, and thank them for everything that they've done. And on our side, Martin Delgado, Dave Gibbons. You'll note, on the Democrat side, I pronounced the Republican side with equal ineptitude as I do the Democrats. Jamie Swafford, Meg Gilley, Merritt Myers, Emily Watson, Heather McNatt, Elizabeth Davis and Jason Lawrence and Scott Stevens. We have a lot of folks who've helped. One of my friends on the floor said, Well, how many people does this take? And I said, Well, you know this is almost a \$100 billion bill, so we all have to get involved in it.

I also wanted to say something about RAY LAHOOD. Mr. LAHOOD is a great committee member. He's going to be leaving Congress at the end of this term and made that announcement this week, and I thought I'd be remiss if we didn't say something about Mr. LAHOOD. He is a great appropriator. He's a guy who had early on worked with the Hershey Retreat to bring more bipartisan civility to the floor. He was instrumental when I was Chair of the Leg branch subcommittee of getting the staff gym started. Indeed, I don't know if we would have it without him and all of his hard work.

And also, when we were in majority, he stood and sat where you are, Mr. Chairman, many times guiding this House through hot debates and emotional issues, and we're all going to miss Mr. LAHOOD.

I want to start off on the bill a little bit because so many people think of agriculture as just farming. And yet, if we look at the breakdown of this bill and we see this large blue part, the actual money in this bill, the majority of it goes to domestic food assistance programs. And it's appropriate that it is in the ag bill because so much of what

we're talking about is national security, as seen through our food policy, but direct farming programs are in this more purplish area, and it's about 35 percent of the bill. We also have money for conservation, rural development for the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, and foreign food assistance. But I think it's important for people to realize that this is not just a bill that affects the rural areas.

I also want to point out that much of this bill our committee doesn't have the control over that we would like to. In fact, if you look at this bill, we have an expression here in Washington called "mandatory and discretionary spending." Discretionary spending is spending that Congress itself can effect on an appropriate bill. Mandatory spending is what authorizing committees do. This would have been done through the farm bill, for example.

Now, I don't like the term "mandatory." I think it should be called automatic spending, maybe even lazy spending, maybe even unchallenged spending, since we debate it once every 5 years and then lock it up in a farm bill. I think that the mandatory portion of this budget, since it is almost 80 percent of the budget, should be opened up and debated. I think there's a lot of things in there that need more scrutiny. Indeed, of the \$18 billion in the discretionary spending area, we have been scrutinized and we've had a good look at it.

I want to make a couple of points. Number one, the bill at its current level will be vetoed. We do not have a veto-proof majority. This bill will pass today, but not by a veto-proof. The President has made it clear that at a 5.9 percent increase over last year, he will veto it. I think it's important for us to realize this since this is a bipartisan body. This is not a veiled threat. The President has the votes to sustain the veto, and so that's what's going to happen. I think we would be better served getting together and bringing down the numbers on this bill.

The second thing that I wanted to point out is there are a lot of issues that we're faced with in this House this week. One of them is the government health care program that's being pushed on the States and taking away a lot of their discretion. Another one is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. These bills are being pushed aside for this bill, and while I have a lot of passion for this bill, being an aggie myself, the reality is, this bill will leave the Chamber and it will sit over with the Senate. The Senate Appropriations Committee, for all intents and purposes, is defunct. We've been working hard. We've been working long in the House to pass our appropriation bills on time, and I commend Mr. OBEY and the Democrat leadership to make sure that we get the bills over there.

And yet, the reality is the Senate is going to sit on this bill, cram it into another bill, stuff it into a shoe box called an omnibus bill, and I think

that's the wrong way to approach things. And at the same time, we're going to have other things that slide.

Another thing I wanted to do is set the record straight on some of the nutrition programs, because we've had and heard from a number of people on the Rules Committee earlier today that this restores funding for important and critical child nutrition programs. And you would think that under Republican control, that the bill did not give any money for food and nutrition programs. And yet, if you look at this chart, Mr. Chairman, going back from 2001 on up to 2008, you can see there's simply a linear progression in nutrition funding that has taken place under Republicans mostly, and now under Democrats. But there's no huge dip. There's no great spike now that the Democrats are in charge. And it's important to set the record straight on that.

In fact, I'm one, call me old fashioned, who doesn't think it's great to have lots and lots of people dependent on government programs. I think we should work to get people more independent, and I don't think that increasing these programs blindly makes sense. For example, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, I don't follow the math on that. Last year the casework estimate was 490,000 people. The actual number to participate was 463,000. And yet this year, even though the projection's 464,000, the budget increase is \$42 million for it, and I don't follow that logic at all. If the number of participants is going down, why is the spending going up? And the President actually had zeroed that out. Why did he do that? Does the President not care about hungry people? No, it's because they are eligible for food stamps. There's another program for them. Why have two bureaucracies doing basically the same thing, especially since you have electronic benefit transfer cards which are very simple to do, and those were some that this committee led in.

The other thing that I wanted to point out on the subject of nutrition and hunger is it's interesting that we debated obesity a lot more than we have debated hunger. I think that's probably a good thing, but I think, on the other hand, it shows that there hasn't been this horrible hunger crisis under Republican rule.

Another point I want to say about this bill, the farm service agencies, right now farm service agencies, there are 58 of them that have no staff. The Chair and I have agreed that these should be closed down. I think that's a step in the right direction; 139 of them have one employee and 338 have two employees and 515 have three employees.

Now, I've heard it said about the VA that you can close down any veterans clinic you want in America as long as it's not located in a congressional district. Well, I guess the same is true with military bases, and it's true with

FSA offices and other offices. We talk about wanting to balance the budget, but when it comes home to our own district, we all backpedal and say, no, we don't want anything closed.

These decisions aren't easy, but we have to be leaders on this and not shirk our responsibility. I think this committee kind of worked through it, and I'm hoping that we're going to continue to work through it as the bill moves through the process.

Renewable energy. There's so much right now in the rural areas from the subject of ethanol, biodiesel, cellulosic ethanol and other economies that we can go out and capitalize in and help bring alternative fuel to America.

□ 1545

In my home State of Georgia, there are about five or six ethanol plants. There are 121 of them nationally, but Georgia has on the drawing table right now to build another 80 ethanol plants just in our one State. That would put Georgia on the national leaders level. I am excited about that. Because if Georgia can do that, then certainly other States should be doing that; and I am glad that this bill puts a lot of investment into renewable energy.

On broadband and distance learning, I think we all have a commitment to that. Two things that the Chair and I have agreed on that are very important is, one, we don't want the government programs to be competing with the private sector. If the private sector is already there, why put a government program out there? And, number two, for the retired stockbroker who has bought his mountain house on the top of the beautiful mountains in Colorado, why should we care if his laptop is hooked up or not? I don't think we have to waste taxpayer money so that he can check his stock quotes while he is in retirement.

I also want to talk a little bit about a horse amendment that we have, some language in the bill that prohibits people who own horses from taking these horses across international lines. If you own a horse in America and this bill passes with the language that is in it, you will not be allowed to take that horse to Mexico or Canada for any purpose.

Now, I understand that there are those who don't want horses to be slaughtered. Most of them are people who have never owned horses, who don't understand horse owners or who are intimidated by special interest groups in Washington. But the reality is sometimes you have to put a horse down, and since we have a problem with that in America, as outlawed by this Congress or the previous Congress, then this bill does give some flexibility to those people. But, in trying to close that loophole, what the committee did is they said now you can't take your horse out of the country and you can't bring one in. It is a ridiculous part of the language, and I am going to move to strike it.

Another issue that I have some concerns about is drug reimportation. I think drug reimportation is a major policy shift, and I believe that we should have a vote on that.

I commend the Chair in reducing the number of earmarks. The earmarks last year in the bill were about 4½ percent. We are starting out at about a 2 percent level. I think that is a great reduction not just in the dollar amount but in the number of earmarks.

And one other area that I was disappointed in that I want to point out is risk-based inspection. This is where USDA inspectors go to food-processing plants and, rather than dwell on all of them equally over time, they focus on the ones who are the bad actors, the ones who have the older equipment and the shoddy practices. They put more time there. It is a common business decision, and yet we are interfering with the USDA's right to do that. It is called "risk-based inspection." I think it is very important to a good, clean, healthy food supply, and we have stopped RBI. I think that is a mistake.

But, overall, there is a lot that's good in the bill. I look forward to the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for yielding to me.

I am the only Californian that sits on the Agriculture Appropriations Committee, and I am very proud that this bill is in partnership with the progressive new provisions that were adopted last week in the farm bill. This spends the money to implement those provisions. As the Chair just said, this bill takes us in a new direction, a direction that rural America can be really proud of.

Many people know California as the most populous State and think of our large metropolitan areas. But few know that California is the number one ag-producing State in the United States. Every one of the 58 counties in California produces agriculture, from the smallest county in San Francisco, which has nursery and flower stock, to the most populous county in California, Los Angeles County, with row crops and cattle ranches.

The new leadership in Congress has taken us in a new direction. That direction is good news for rural America. That is good news for fresh foods, for fresh vegetables and fresh fruits to get into the diet. This bill takes us in a new direction for consumers. A new direction so that people have choices. A new direction for green technology to be used in the energy field. A new direction for conservation to be a part of good management practices.

I applaud the committee's new Chair for taking us in a new direction and the opportunity for farming in America to be economically viable. This is good because it preserves open space and

preserves the rural character, which is such a strength of this country.

For California, this is good news. Our agriculture is like our technology. It's changing, always changing. It needs to be state-of-the-art of technology, of research, of university work. We are the leaders in organic growing, from wines to artichokes. I am proud to represent the part of California that is called the "Salad Bowl Capital of the World." The farmers who implement the best management practices in caring not only for their farm workers, and there is a big discussion on that in issues with immigration, but we have the largest farm worker force in the United States and they are now getting paid good wages. In fact, a lot of them have their own health care plans, which most Americans don't have, and they have 401(k)s for their families and scholarships for their children to go to school. This is a new attitude about farm workers.

I want to thank Congresswoman DELAURO, the Chair of this committee, for taking America into a new direction, a more healthy direction.

Let's reject the reckless amendments to this bill that undermine the positive gains made for America. This is a good appropriations bill. I applaud the Chair, Mr. OBEY, for bringing it to the floor and to the members of the committee, and I urge all my colleagues to adopt this bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me first begin by congratulating the hardest-working Member of the Congress, Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO, for this outstanding bill.

Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee, I rise to voice my strong support for H.R. 3161, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill. Again, I want to congratulate Chairwoman DELAURO and the subcommittee staff for the product here before us today. I also want to thank Ranking Member KINGSTON of the minority subcommittee staff for working with us to produce this product.

Over the past 8 months, I have learned a lot about agriculture policy. When asked why I serve on this subcommittee, considering my largely urban and suburban district, I quickly respond by saying this bill touches the lives of 647,000 residents of the Second District of Illinois. We all eat, we all want safe food, and we all want safe medicines.

With the recent passage of the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007, our Nation's agriculture policy and spending reflects our growing invest-

ments not only in rural development and commodity programs but in nutrition, conservation, and renewable energy. We want to continue to support our farmers as well as feed the hungry, protect our Nation's food supply, and invest in research.

One out of five Americans at some point in time in their lives will participate in at least one domestic food assistance program. Our nutrition programs serve as the first line of defense against combating hunger by helping low-income families purchase food. This bill illustrates Congress's commitment to protecting our country's most vulnerable populations. It accomplishes the following:

It increases the Food Stamp Program by \$1.7 billion and creates a \$3 billion contingency reserve, which helps feed over 26 million people annually. It restores the President's proposed cuts to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and expands the program that serves over 485,000 people monthly by adding five new States. It appropriates \$5.6 billion to the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children and restores State grants to help administer the program. It supports the expansion of the simplified summer school food program that provides up to two meals a day to children under the age of 18 during the summer.

This bill also addresses a wide variety of needs, ranging from increased grants and loans for rural communities to fully funding the USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service.

The increases in this bill are sensible, they are prudent, they reflect our priorities, reinforcing our commitment to feed the hungry, to house the needy, and to protect us all.

I recommend that my colleagues vote against any amendments cutting these vital programs, and I strongly urge them to vote for this bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I think we kind of know where we are heading on various amendments. I look forward to that amendment.

And, again, I have enjoyed working with you and the staff. You have a semi-good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, too, want to say thank you to my colleague, Mr. KINGSTON, in working with him; and it is not the first time we have had an opportunity to work together. We have been working together over the years.

As I said, I am very proud of the bill and the goals that we set out and the direction that we set out to strengthen rural America and deal with our public health and nutrition, energy, conservation and looking at how we invest in our research.

I look forward to the balance of our time and the amendment process, but I do, too, want to associate myself with

my colleague from Georgia's remarks about our colleague on the committee, Mr. LAHOOD, who has been an outstanding member of this committee but has been an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, someone you could always count on to speak his mind but to be fair and to do his best for his constituents and for this Nation.

I also want to say thank you to the many staffers who have worked hour

after hour on this bill to make today possible. As a former staff member, I know that these efforts don't come together by some alchemy, but it is because of the incredible hard work that people put into it over many, many hours.

And let me thank Martha Foley, subcommittee Clerk; as well as Leslie Barrack; Diem-Lihn Jones; Adrienne Simmonson; Kelly Wade; Brian Ronholm, my staff. Also, Ashley

Turton, my Chief of Staff; and Leticia Mederos, Legislative Director. I also want to say thank you to Martin Delgado, Dave Gibbons, and Jamie Swafford on the minority staff. I thank everyone for their time and their patience in putting this effort together.

I believe nothing could be more important for us to move forward on this bill and get it passed. I think it is in the best interest of this Nation.

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS</b>					
<b>Production, Processing, and Marketing</b>					
Office of the Secretary.....	5,097	18,355	5,505	+408	-12,850
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist.....	10,487	11,347	10,847	+360	-500
National Appeals Division.....	14,466	15,056	15,056	+590	---
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	8,270	9,035	8,622	+352	-413
Homeland Security staff.....	931	2,412	2,252	+1,321	-160
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	16,361	17,024	16,723	+362	-301
Common computing environment.....	107,971	---	---	-107,971	---
(Provided in other accounts) (NA).....	---	(90,900)	(90,900)	(+90,900)	---
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	5,850	30,863	6,076	+226	-24,787
Working capital fund.....	1,891	---	---	-1,891	---
<b>Total, Executive Operations.....</b>	<b>166,227</b>	<b>85,737</b>	<b>59,576</b>	<b>-106,651</b>	<b>-26,161</b>
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights....	818	897	897	+79	---
Office of Civil Rights.....	20,020	23,147	23,147	+3,127	---
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration..	673	739	709	+36	-30
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	(185,919)	(216,837)	(196,616)	(+10,697)	(-20,221)
Payments to GSA.....	146,257	156,590	156,590	+10,333	---
Building operations and maintenance.....	39,662	60,247	40,026	+364	-20,221
Hazardous materials management.....	11,887	12,200	12,200	+313	---
Departmental administration.....	23,144	24,608	23,913	+769	-695
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,795	4,099	3,936	+141	-163
Office of Communications.....	9,338	9,720	9,720	+382	---
Office of the Inspector General.....	80,052	83,998	85,998	+5,946	+2,000
Office of the General Counsel.....	39,227	41,721	40,964	+1,737	-757
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.....	596	654	626	+30	-28
Economic Research Service.....	75,193	82,544	79,282	+4,089	-3,262
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	147,253	167,699	166,099	+18,846	-1,600
Census of Agriculture.....	(36,249)	(54,325)	(52,725)	(+16,476)	(-1,600)
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,128,944	1,021,517	1,076,340	-52,604	+54,823
Buildings and facilities.....	---	16,000	64,000	+64,000	+48,000
<b>Total, Agricultural Research Service.....</b>	<b>1,128,944</b>	<b>1,037,517</b>	<b>1,140,340</b>	<b>+11,396</b>	<b>+102,823</b>
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities.....	671,419	562,518	671,419	---	+108,901
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(12,000)	(11,880)	(11,880)	(-120)	---
Extension activities.....	450,346	431,125	463,886	+13,540	+32,761
Integrated activities.....	55,234	20,120	57,244	+2,010	+37,124
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers.....	5,940	6,930	6,930	+990	---
<b>Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.....</b>	<b>1,182,939</b>	<b>1,020,693</b>	<b>1,199,479</b>	<b>+16,540</b>	<b>+178,786</b>
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.....	721	792	759	+38	-33
*Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	846,230	945,550	874,643	+28,413	-70,907
Animal welfare (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA.	---	(9,000)	---	---	(-9,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	4,946	8,931	4,946	---	-3,985
<b>Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....</b>	<b>851,176</b>	<b>954,481</b>	<b>879,589</b>	<b>+28,413</b>	<b>-74,892</b>



AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services.....	74,937	74,988	79,945	+5,008	+4,957
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(62,211)	(61,233)	(61,233)	(-978)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32).....	16,425	16,798	16,798	+373	---
Discretionary appropriations.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	---	---
Payments to states and possessions.....	1,334	1,334	1,334	---	---
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	112,696	113,120	118,077	+5,381	+4,957
<hr/>					
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses.....	37,785	44,385	41,115	+3,330	-3,270
Grain inspection, packers and stockyards administration (user fees) (leg. proposal)NA.....	---	(21,200)	---	---	(-21,200)
Limitation on inspection and weighing services....	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	---	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....	600	659	632	+32	-27
Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	892,136	930,120	930,120	+37,984	---
Food safety inspection (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.....	---	(96,000)	---	---	(-96,000)
Lab accreditation fees.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing....	4,976,236	4,874,722	5,019,299	+43,063	+144,577
<hr/>					
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	632	695	666	+34	-29
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,030,193	1,228,662	1,127,409	+97,216	-101,253
(Common computing environment) (NA).....	---	(64,200)	(64,200)	(+64,200)	---
(Transfer from export loans).....	(343)	(359)	(353)	(+10)	(-6)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(3,207)	(2,761)	(2,749)	(-458)	(-12)
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(303,309)	(311,737)	(310,230)	(+6,921)	(-1,507)
(Transfer from farm storage loan program account).....	---	(4,660)	---	---	(-4,660)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts.....	(306,859)	(319,517)	(313,332)	(+6,473)	(-6,185)
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,337,052)	(1,548,179)	(1,440,741)	(+103,689)	(-107,438)
State mediation grants.....	4,208	4,000	4,000	-208	---
Grassroot source water protection program.....	3,713	---	3,713	---	+3,713
Dairy indemnity program.....	100	100	100	---	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency.....	1,038,214	1,232,762	1,135,222	+97,008	-97,540
<hr/>					
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(207,642)	(223,857)	(223,857)	(+16,215)	---
Guaranteed.....	(1,386,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(-186,000)	---
Subtotal.....	(1,593,642)	(1,423,857)	(1,423,857)	(-169,785)	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	(643,500)	(629,595)	(629,595)	(-13,905)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,138,500)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-138,500)	---
Subsidized guaranteed.....	(271,886)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(-21,886)	---
Subtotal.....	(2,053,886)	(1,879,595)	(1,879,595)	(-174,291)	---
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(2,000)	(3,960)	(3,960)	(+1,960)	---
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(100,000)	(59,400)	(100,000)	---	(+40,600)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,749,528)	(3,366,812)	(3,407,412)	(-342,116)	(+40,600)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	8,700	9,962	9,962	+1,262	---
Guaranteed.....	8,039	4,800	4,800	-3,239	---
Subtotal.....	16,739	14,762	14,762	-1,977	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	75,225	79,896	79,896	+4,671	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	28,121	24,200	24,200	-3,921	---
Subsidized guaranteed.....	27,379	33,350	33,350	+5,971	---
Subtotal.....	130,725	137,446	137,446	+6,721	---
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	423	125	125	-298	---
Boll weevil eradication.....	1,900	---	---	-1,900	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	149,787	152,333	152,333	+2,546	---
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)....	303,309	311,737	310,230	+6,921	-1,507
Administrative expenses.....	7,920	7,920	7,920	---	---
Total, ACIF expenses.....	311,229	319,657	318,150	+6,921	-1,507
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund... (Loan authorization).....	461,016 (3,749,528)	471,990 (3,366,812)	470,483 (3,407,412)	+9,467 (-342,116)	-1,507 (+40,600)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,499,230	1,704,752	1,605,705	+106,475	-99,047
Risk Management Agency, Administrative and operating expenses.....	76,658	79,062	78,833	+2,175	-229
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,576,520	1,784,509	1,685,204	+108,684	-99,305
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	4,379,256	4,818,099	4,818,099	+438,843	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	23,098,328	12,983,053	12,983,053	-10,115,275	---
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Farm Storage Facility Loans Program Account:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	---	4,660	---	---	-4,660
Total, Corporations.....	27,477,584	17,805,812	17,801,152	-9,676,432	-4,660
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs.....	34,030,340	24,465,043	24,505,655	-9,524,685	+40,612
(By transfer).....	(306,859)	(319,517)	(313,332)	(+6,473)	(-6,185)
(Loan authorization).....	(3,749,528)	(3,366,812)	(3,407,412)	(-342,116)	(+40,600)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(109,674)	(108,696)	(108,696)	(-978)	---
<hr/>					
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	742	822	781	+39	-41
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations.....	763,360	801,825	851,910	+88,550	+50,085
(Common computing environment) (NA).....	---	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Watershed surveys and planning.....	6,056	---	6,556	+500	+6,556
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	---	---	37,000	+37,000	+37,000
Watershed rehabilitation program.....	31,309	5,807	31,586	+277	+25,779
Resource conservation and development.....	51,088	14,653	52,370	+1,282	+37,717
Healthy forests reserve program.....	---	2,476	---	---	-2,476
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service...	851,813	824,761	979,422	+127,609	+154,661
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	852,555	825,583	980,203	+127,648	+154,620
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development...	632	695	666	+34	-29
Rural Development:					
Rural community advancement program:					
Rural community program account 1/:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct.....	(297,000)	(302,414)	(350,000)	(+53,000)	(+47,586)
Guaranteed.....	(207,900)	(210,000)	(250,000)	(+42,100)	(+40,000)
Subtotal, Loan authorizations.....	(504,900)	(512,414)	(600,000)	(+95,100)	(+87,586)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Community facility:					
Direct.....	19,038	16,784	19,425	+387	+2,641
Guaranteed.....	7,609	7,728	9,200	+1,591	+1,472
Grants.....	16,830	---	23,117	+6,287	+23,117
Rural community development initiative....	6,287	---	---	-6,287	---
Economic impact initiative grants.....	17,820	---	---	-17,820	---
High energy cost grants.....	25,740	---	---	-25,740	---
Tribal college grants.....	4,419	---	4,000	-419	+4,000
Subtotal, RCP subsidies and grants.....	97,743	24,512	55,742	-42,001	+31,230
Rural Business Program Account 2/:					
(Guaranteed business and industry loans).....	(913,962)	(1,000,000)	(1,250,000)	(+336,038)	(+250,000)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy..	39,849	43,200	54,000	+14,151	+10,800
Grants:					
Rural business enterprise.....	39,600	---	40,000	+400	+40,000
Rural business opportunity.....	2,970	---	3,000	+30	+3,000
Delta regional authority.....	1,980	---	3,000	+1,020	+3,000
Subtotal, RBP subsidies and grants.....	84,399	43,200	100,000	+15,601	+56,800
Rural water & waste disposal program account 3/:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct.....	(990,000)	(1,080,239)	(1,000,000)	(+10,000)	(-80,239)
Guaranteed.....	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Loan authorizations.....	1,065,000	1,155,239	1,075,000	+10,000	-80,239
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Direct subsidy.....	98,604	153,394	68,100	-30,504	-85,294
Water and waste grants.....	437,748	344,920	500,000	+62,252	+155,080
Solid waste management grants.....	3,465	3,465	3,465	---	---
Emerg. community water assistance grants..	13,692	---	---	-13,692	---
Water and waste financing revolving fund..	495	---	500	+5	+500
Water well system grants.....	990	1,000	1,000	+10	---
Subtotal, Water subsidies and grants....	554,994	502,779	573,065	+18,071	+70,286

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Less adjustment (rounding).....	-1	---	---	+1	---
Total, Rural community advancement program.. (Transfer to High energy costs grants)....	737,135 (-25,740)	570,491 ---	728,807 ---	-8,328 (+25,740)	+158,316 ---
RD expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	161,298	208,194	175,382	+14,084	-32,812
(Common computing environment).....	---	(6,700)	(6,700)	(+6,700)	---
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(452,927)	(434,890)	(462,521)	(+9,594)	(+27,631)
(Transfer from RDLFP).....	(4,774)	(4,576)	(4,861)	(+87)	(+285)
(Transfer from RETLP).....	(38,623)	(37,009)	(39,405)	(+782)	(+2,396)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.	(496,324)	(476,475)	(506,787)	(+10,463)	(+30,312)
Total, RD expenses.....	(657,622)	(684,669)	(682,169)	(+24,547)	(-2,500)
Total, Rural Development.....	898,433	778,685	904,189	+5,756	+125,504
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	(1,129,391)	---	(1,129,391)	---	(+1,129,391)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(3,644,224)	(4,848,611)	(3,716,425)	(+72,201)	(-1,132,186)
Subtotal, Single family.....	(4,773,615)	(4,848,611)	(4,845,816)	(+72,201)	(-2,795)
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	(34,652)	(22,855)	(34,652)	---	(+11,797)
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	(99,000)	---	(99,000)	---	(+99,000)
Site loans (sec. 524).....	(5,000)	(5,045)	(5,046)	(+46)	(+1)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(99,000)	(200,000)	(99,000)	---	(-101,000)
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	(1,485)	(1,408)	(1,486)	(+1)	(+78)
Single family housing credit sales.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	(4,998)	---	(5,000)	(+2)	(+5,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(5,027,750)	(5,087,919)	(5,100,000)	(+72,250)	(+12,081)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	113,278	---	105,824	-7,454	+105,824
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	42,641	10,070	44,359	+1,718	+34,289
Subtotal, Single family.....	155,919	10,070	150,183	-5,736	+140,113
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	10,240	6,461	9,796	-444	+3,335
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	45,213	---	42,184	-3,029	+42,184
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	7,663	18,800	9,306	+1,643	-9,494
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	673	523	552	-121	+29
Single family housing credit sales.....	48	---	---	-48	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	123	---	142	+19	+142
Multi-family housing preservation.....	8,910	---	---	-8,910	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	228,789	35,854	212,163	-16,626	+176,309
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).	452,927	434,890	462,521	+9,594	+27,631
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program. (Loan authorization).....	681,716 (5,027,750)	470,744 (5,087,919)	674,684 (5,100,000)	-7,032 (+72,250)	+203,940 (+12,081)
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521).....	608,100	567,000	525,100	-83,000	-41,900
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)).....	7,920	---	7,920	---	+7,920
Total, Rental assistance program.....	616,020	567,000	533,020	-83,000	-33,980

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural housing voucher program.....	15,840	---	---	-15,840	---
Multifamily housing revitalization program account	---	27,800	27,800	+27,800	---
Total, Multifamily housing revitalization...	---	27,800	27,800	+27,800	---
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	33,660	9,500	40,000	+6,340	+30,500
Rural housing assistance grants.....	43,603	39,000	39,000	-4,603	---
Farm labor housing program account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(38,117)	(13,520)	(50,000)	(+11,883)	(+36,480)
Loan subsidy.....	18,277	5,849	21,630	+3,353	+15,781
Grants.....	13,860	4,000	25,000	+11,140	+21,000
Total, Farm Labor Housing Program Account...	32,137	9,849	46,630	+14,493	+36,781
=====					
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,422,976	1,123,893	1,361,134	-61,842	+237,241
(Loan authorization).....	(5,065,867)	(5,101,439)	(5,150,000)	(+84,133)	(+48,561)
=====					
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(33,870)	(33,772)	(33,772)	(-98)	---
Loan subsidy.....	14,927	14,485	14,485	-442	---
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	4,774	4,576	4,861	+87	+285
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund.....	19,701	19,061	19,346	-355	+285
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(24,752)	(33,077)	(33,077)	(+8,325)	---
Direct subsidy.....	5,406	---	---	-5,406	---
Mandatory subsidy (NA) .....	---	(7,472)	(7,472)	(+7,472)	---
Rural economic development grants (NA).....	---	(10,000)	(10,000)	(+10,000)	---
Rural cooperative development grants:					
Cooperative development.....	3,753	4,455	4,455	+702	---
Appropriate technology transfer					
for rural areas .....	936	---	2,475	+1,539	+2,475
Cooperative research agreement.....	495	---	495	---	+495
Value-added agricultural product					
market development.....	20,295	15,000	20,295	---	+5,295
Grants to assist minority producers.....	1,239	1,473	1,473	+234	---
Total, Rural Cooperative development grants.	26,718	20,928	29,193	+2,475	+8,265
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants.....	11,088	---	11,088	---	+11,088
Renewable energy program:					
(Loan authorization).....	(176,512)	(195,470)	(250,000)	(+73,488)	(+54,530)
Loan subsidy.....	11,456	18,941	24,225	+12,769	+5,284
Grants.....	11,385	15,000	21,775	+10,390	+6,775
Total, Renewable energy program.....	22,841	33,941	46,000	+23,159	+12,059
=====					
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service.....	85,754	73,930	105,627	+19,873	+31,697
(Loan authorization).....	(235,134)	(262,319)	(316,849)	(+81,715)	(+54,530)
=====					
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%.....	(99,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+1,000)	---
Direct, Municipal rate.....	(100,764)	---	---	(-100,764)	---
Direct, FFB.....	(2,700,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,500,000)	(+1,800,000)	(+500,000)
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(990,000)	---	---	(-990,000)	---
Guaranteed underwriting.....	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)	---
Subtotal, Electric.....	(5,389,764)	(4,100,000)	(4,600,000)	(-789,764)	(+500,000)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%.....	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	---	---
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(419,760)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(-169,760)	---
Direct, FFB.....	(125,000)	(295,000)	(295,000)	(+170,000)	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	(689,760)	(690,000)	(690,000)	(+240)	---
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(6,079,524)	(4,790,000)	(5,290,000)	(-789,524)	(+500,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%.....	2,119	120	120	-1,999	---
Direct, Municipal rate.....	1,522	---	---	-1,522	---
Subtotal, Electric.....	3,641	120	120	-3,521	---
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%.....	537	116	116	-421	---
Direct, Treasury rate.....	126	1,675	1,675	+1,549	---
Direct, FFB.....	---	1,829	1,829	+1,829	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	663	3,620	3,620	+2,957	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	4,304	3,740	3,740	-564	---
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	38,623	37,009	39,405	+782	+2,396
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account.. (Loan authorization).....	42,927 (6,079,524)	40,749 (4,790,000)	43,145 (5,290,000)	+218 (-789,524)	+2,396 (+500,000)
High energy costs grants (by transfer).....	(25,740)	---	---	(-25,740)	---
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications.....	(495,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-195,000)	---
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(495,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-195,000)	---
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants.....	29,700	24,750	35,000	+5,300	+10,250
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct.....	10,643	6,450	6,450	-4,193	---
Grants.....	8,910	---	17,820	+8,910	+17,820
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	49,253	31,200	59,270	+10,017	+28,070
Total, Rural Utilities Service..... (Loan authorization).....	92,180 (6,574,524)	71,949 (5,090,000)	102,415 (5,590,000)	+10,235 (-984,524)	+30,466 (+500,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs..... (By transfer)..... (Loan authorization).....	2,499,975 (522,064) (14,359,387)	2,049,152 (476,475) (13,121,411)	2,474,031 (506,787) (13,981,849)	-25,944 (-15,277) (-377,538)	+424,879 (+30,312) (+860,438)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	597	655	628	+31	-27
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs.....	7,614,523	7,592,797	7,668,156	+53,633	+75,359
Transfer from section 32.....	5,731,073	6,304,475	6,235,057	+503,984	-69,418
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	13,345,596	13,897,272	13,903,213	+557,617	+5,941



AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	5,204,430	5,386,597	5,620,000	+415,570	+233,403
Food stamp program:					
Expenses.....	33,463,137	35,053,973	35,053,973	+1,590,836	---
Armed forces provision.....	1,000	---	1,000	---	+1,000
Reserve.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	---	---
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa	1,557,397	1,621,250	1,621,250	+63,853	---
The emergency food assistance program.....	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---
CSFP transitional benefit.....	---	21,000	---	---	-21,000
CSFP outreach grant.....	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
Total, Food stamp program.....	38,161,534	39,838,223	39,816,223	+1,654,689	-22,000
Commodity assistance program:					
Commodity supplemental food program.....	107,202	---	150,000	+42,798	+150,000
Farmers market nutrition program.....	19,800	19,800	20,000	+200	+200
Emergency food assistance program.....	49,500	49,500	50,000	+500	+500
Pacific island and disaster assistance.....	1,070	1,070	1,070	---	---
Total, Commodity assistance program.....	177,572	70,370	221,070	+43,498	+150,700
Nutrition programs administration.....	140,252	148,926	146,926	+6,674	-2,000
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	57,029,384	59,341,388	59,707,432	+2,678,048	+366,044
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	57,029,981	59,342,043	59,708,060	+2,678,079	+366,017
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	156,220	168,209	159,136	+2,916	-9,073
(Transfer from export loans).....	(4,918)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(+67)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(166)	---	---	(-166)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses program level.....	(161,304)	(173,194)	(164,121)	(+2,817)	(-9,073)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level.....	(1,214,711)	(1,219,400)	(1,219,400)	(+4,689)	---
Appropriation.....	1,214,711	1,219,400	1,219,400	+4,689	---
Salaries and expenses:					
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)	166	---	---	-166	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	3,207	2,761	2,749	-458	-12
Subtotal.....	3,373	2,761	2,749	-624	-12
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level.....	(1,214,711)	(1,219,400)	(1,219,400)	(+4,689)	---
Appropriation.....	1,218,084	1,222,161	1,222,149	+4,065	-12
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	4,918	4,985	4,985	+67	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	343	359	353	+10	-6
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	5,261	5,344	5,338	+77	-6

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants.....	99,000	100,000	100,000	+1,000	---
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,478,565	1,495,714	1,486,623	+8,058	-9,091
(By transfer).....	(5,084)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(-99)	---
=====					
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	1,569,244	1,635,709	1,697,709	+128,465	+62,000
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(352,200)	(339,195)	---	(-352,200)	(-339,195)
Medical device user fee act.....	(43,726)	(47,500)	---	(-43,726)	(-47,500)
Animal drug user fee act.....	(11,604)	(13,696)	(13,696)	(+2,092)	---
Generic drug user fee.....	---	(15,701)	---	---	(-15,701)
Reinspection fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.....	---	(23,276)	---	---	(-23,276)
Food export fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.....	---	(3,741)	---	---	(-3,741)
Subtotal.....	(1,976,774)	(2,051,801)	(1,711,405)	(-265,369)	(-340,396)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings)....	(17,522)	(18,398)	(18,398)	(+876)	---
Export and color certification.....	(8,481)	(9,500)	(9,500)	(+1,019)	---
Payments to GSA.....	(126,871)	(131,533)	(131,533)	(+4,662)	---
Buildings and facilities.....	4,950	4,950	4,950	---	---
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	1,574,194	1,640,659	1,702,659	+128,465	+62,000
=====					
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	97,981	116,000	102,550	+4,569	-13,450
Transaction fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.....	---	(86,000)	---	---	(-86,000)
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(44,250)	(46,000)	(46,000)	(+1,750)	---
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	1,672,175	1,756,659	1,805,209	+133,034	+48,550
=====					
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Denali Commission .....	743	---	---	-743	---
Hunger Fellowships.....	---	---	2,475	+2,475	+2,475
Section 32 (rescission) .....	-37,601	-65,452	-210,361	-172,760	-144,909
Specialty crop grants (sec. 736).....	6,930	---	10,000	+3,070	+10,000
Healthy Forest Reserve.....	2,476	---	---	-2,476	---
Simplified Summer Food Program.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Food stamp program employment & training (rescission).	-11,200	---	---	+11,200	---
ARS buildings and facilities (rescission).....	---	-16,000	---	---	+16,000
Fruit and vegetable program.....	---	---	21,000	+21,000	+21,000
WIC (rescission).....	---	---	-16,069	-16,069	-16,069
High energy cost grant (rescission).....	---	---	-25,740	-25,740	-25,740
Department of Homeland Security (rescission).....	---	---	-8,000	-8,000	-8,000
Total, title VII, General provisions.....	-38,652	-81,452	-221,695	-183,043	-140,243

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Public Law 480 Title II Grants (Titles I/III) (emerg). General Provisions	450,000	---	---	-450,000	---
Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (Title III) (emerg)...	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Emergency Forestry Conservation Reserve program (Title IV) (emergency).....	115,000	---	---	-115,000	---
Stafford Act Disaster Relief (Title V) (emergency).... Farm Service Agency	40,000	---	---	-40,000	---
Salaries and expenses (Title VI).....	37,500	---	---	-37,500	---
-----					
Agricultural Assistance (Title IX)	---	---	---	---	---
Crop disaster assistance (Sec. 9001) (emergency).....	1,552,000	---	---	-1,552,000	---
Livestock compensation program (Sec.9002a) (emergency)	1,203,000	---	---	-1,203,000	---
Livestock indemnity payments (Sec. 9002b) (emergency)..	29,000	---	---	-29,000	---
Emergency conservation program (Sec. 9003) (emergency)	16,000	---	---	-16,000	---
National Dairy Market Loss Payment Program (Sec. 9006) (emergency).....	31,000	---	---	-31,000	---
Dairy assistance (Sec. 9007) (emergency).....	16,000	---	---	-16,000	---
Low-income migrant and seasonal farmworkers (Sec. 9009) (emergency).....	16,000	---	---	-16,000	---
Conservation security program (Sec. 9010) (emergency)..	115,000	---	---	-115,000	---
Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses (Sec. 9011) (emergency).....	22,000	---	---	-22,000	---
-----					
Subtotal, Title IX.....	3,000,000	---	---	-3,000,000	---
-----					
Total, Public Law 110-28 .....	3,652,500	---	---	-3,652,500	---
(emergency appropriations) .....	(3,615,000)	---	---	(-3,615,000)	---
=====					
Grand total.....	101,177,439	89,852,742	90,738,086	-10,439,353	+885,344
Appropriations.....	(97,611,240)	(89,934,194)	(90,998,256)	(-6,612,984)	(+1,064,062)
Emergency Appropriations.....	3,615,000	---	---	-3,615,000	---
Rescissions.....	(-48,801)	(-81,452)	(-260,170)	(-211,369)	(-178,718)
(By transfer).....	(834,007)	(800,977)	(825,104)	(-8,903)	(+24,127)
(Loan authorization).....	(18,108,915)	(16,488,223)	(17,389,261)	(-719,654)	(+901,038)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(153,924)	(154,696)	(154,696)	(+772)	---
=====					

## FOOTNOTES:

- 1/ Budget request includes program account under Rural Housing.
- 2/ Budget request includes program account under Rural Business-Cooperative Service.
- 3/ Budget request includes program account under Rural Utilities Service.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to thank Chairman PETERSON Chairman BACA, and members of the House Agriculture Committee for their continued commitment and interest in supporting our agriculture industry, producers—and specifically supporting modernization of the food stamp program, increasing access to fresh produce, particularly for low-income neighborhoods and working with the Congressional Black Caucus and urban Members to accommodate the needs of diverse communities.

Throughout our Nation, we have a host of communities that are disconnected from accessing fresh fruits and vegetables. An increasing number of families are facing hunger and food insecurity: according to USDA's most recent data, more than 35 million Americans are unable to purchase food on a regular basis. Both sets of problems stem in part from the same cause: in urban as well as rural areas, too many low-income families live in "food deserts" where access to fresh, healthy foods is lacking.

I have worked with my fellow urban Members on a package of urban needs—ranging from making mandatory funds for the Community Food Project grant, increasing access to fresh fruits and produce, defining the term food desert, and creating a new Urban Health Enterprise grant program to strengthen links between producers to actual providers in urban communities.

All but one of these amendments are included in the Manager's Amendment, and I thank the Chairman for working with us to ensure urban members have a stake in the farm bill.

Mr. Chairman, although we still must find funding for the Community Food Projects grant; overall, the 2007 Farm Bill contains significant gains to promote access, expansion and education on nutrition.

As you may know, with regard to nutrition, the bill modernizes the food stamp program by: 1. Requiring all states go to an electronic system; 2. Increasing the minimum food benefit of participants; 3. Indexing asset limits and excludes retirement and education accounts, and combat pay.

The nutrition title extends and funds the Emergency Food Assistance Program to provide needed commodities to food banks and homeless shelters.

And it expands the authority of the Senior Farmer's Market Nutrition Program and creates a demonstration project to evaluate strategies to address obesity among low-income communities.

In conclusion Mr. Chairman, for far too many urban dwellers, the choice comes down to traveling long distances to buy groceries or shopping at expensive corner stores that often sell high-fat, high-sugar convenience food and little or no fresh produce. The consequences are byproducts of poverty: diabetes, obesity, and heart disease.

In the interests of public health, cost-efficiency, and social justice, we should consider policies to increase the availability of and access to fresh fruits and vegetables in underserved neighborhoods and communities.

I call on my colleagues to support the Farm Bill, because of the gains in nutrition the committee has included in this bill.

In addition to supporting farmers and our agriculture industry; this bill increases healthy food options in our poorest communities, cre-

ates incentives for producers and retailers to provide foods that provide healthy food options, and increasing consumer education about healthy alternatives at school and home.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Agriculture Sub-committee Chairwoman, Ms. DELAURO, and the ranking Republican, Mr. KINGSTON. They have done a commendable job in putting this measure together in this first year in their respective positions.

All along the way, Ms. DELAURO reached across the aisle to sound out the concern of the members on this side of the aisle—and the work product shows her bi-partisan efforts.

While I do not agree with everything in the bill, I think it is a good product, all things considered. I especially want to thank the Chairwoman for her efforts to increase funding in the bill for the cooperative State research, education and extension service. The CSREES funding level was below the level where it should have been coming out of the subcommittee.

After hearing the concerns of many members, Ms. DELAURO and Mr. KINGSTON closed ranks and fixed the problem. That funding gap was a particular issue to many members, especially those from rural, farming areas.

I am pleased to note that the bill contains much in the way of agriculture research funding in a number of areas. This is important to many areas, particularly renewable fuels and food production science, to name two areas. The more we can make substantive progress in both of these areas, the better for the consumer and the farm community.

I do want to point out a couple of areas where I think we can and should improve on the bill. First, there is a provision, section 746, which currently reads, "no funds in this act may be used to authorize qualified health claims for conventional foods".

I understand that there will be an amendment later on that stipulates no funds for FDA will be used for this purpose. However, this amendment does not address the problem.

If this provision, or a similar one, is intended to help FDA avoid wasted time and resources on frivolous petitions, it misses the mark. Nothing in the language removes FDA's responsibility to review these petitions, as required by law. The provision only denies final approval, or "authorization" of the use of valid claims.

This is bad health policy, and it is bad fiscal policy, and I urge the chairwoman to relook at the provision in conference, lest its impact come back to haunt us.

On another issue, the horse slaughter language, the provision, as written, is opposed by animal experts across the country—real experts, including veterinarians and others. The way the language is written, it precludes health inspections and certifications for the legal transport of horses, for example.

Finally, I think, like some others on both sides of the aisle, that we have short-changed some necessary program areas, on occasion, in the past.

But I also think that, as with some other bills, we are going a little far in adding extra spending. Too much spending can do as much damage as too little spending.

It is important to remember that when we give agencies too much money, they spend more than they need to spend simply to hold their annual baseline intact. This is not a healthy way to manage the Nation's resources.

We have some discretion here, and we should use that discretion since, apparently, we have turned a blind eye to the serious and growing problem of out-of-control entitlements.

In summary, let me, again, commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut. I think you have done a fine job, and I look forward to continuing to work with you to improve this bill as we go forward.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise in strong support of the H.R. 3161, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2008.

As a member of this Subcommittee, I am extremely proud of the work of the Subcommittee and our members on both sides of the aisle, in crafting a bill which truly impacts and touches the lives of everyone who lives in this great Nation of ours, as well as millions of individuals around the world.

Our bill invests in Rural America, providing funding to accommodate some \$5.1 billion in affordable loans for low income families in rural areas, which will support approximately 38,000 single family homeownership opportunities.

We invest in rural communities, by expanding resources devoted to economic development programs and access to broadband telecommunication services to bridge the digital divide in rural, underserved areas.

We address the health care and emergency needs of rural areas, as well as providing support for the rebuilding of our Nation's rural infrastructure.

We invest in the protection of the Nation's Public Health, by providing nearly \$930 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service as well as \$1.7 billion for the Food and Drug Administration—including increases to begin a transformation of food safety regulation, improving drug safety, monitor prescription drug advertisements and expanding the review of new generic drug applications.

To fight hunger in America, our bill makes investments which will expand nutrition, providing \$958 million for nutrition programs, including the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable program and the Simplified Summer Food program.

We provide \$5.6 billion for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), which is expected to benefit over 8.4 million Americans over the next year.

Not only does this bill provide the resources necessary to keep nearly 26 million of the nation's poorest from going hungry, we also expand Emergency Food Assistance Program, so that food banks, soup kitchens, and other emergency feeding sites have needed resources. The bill also expands the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program to all 50 states.

We invest in the transformation of our Energy Future, providing \$1.2 billion for renewable energy, which was \$955.3 million above 2007 and \$810.4 million above the President's request—and includes funding for bio-energy and renewable energy research and development, including loans and grants in rural areas. The resources provided will be key building blocks in the expansion of renewable fuel production needed to encourage American energy independence and protect our environment.

We invest in Conservation, providing over \$979 million for conservation efforts and community development. This bill restores many of the programs slated for major reductions in the president's request, including the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, Resource Conservation and Development, and the watershed programs which are funded \$75 million—more than double last year's levels.

This investment will continue our efforts to improve both funding and access to conservation programs that take environmentally sensitive land out of farming and encourage environmentally friendly practices on working farmland.

Finally, I would like to congratulate my Chairwoman, ROSA DELAURO, for the outstanding job she's done in stewarding and leading the important work of our Subcommittee.

And I would be remiss if I did not recognize and thank the staff of Subcommittee—Martha Foley, Leslie Barrack, Adrienne Simonson, Diem-Linh Joan and Kelly Wade of the Majority staff; and Martin Delgado, Jamie Swafford and Dave Gibbons on the Minority staff, and of course, Michael Reed, and Niki Newberry of my staff.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the FY08 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, I would like to place into the record a listing of Congressionally-directed projects in my home state of Idaho that are contained within the report to the FY08 Agriculture, Rural Development and FDA Appropriations bill.

I'd like to take just a few minutes to describe why I supported these projects and why they are valuable to the nation and its taxpayers.

First, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) grants included below are targeted to our nation's Land Grant Colleges. In the case of Idaho, these funds are used by the University of Idaho to conduct research on a variety of crops important to the Pacific Northwest. I have also supported research in Washington and Oregon because their research is invaluable to my constituents as well.

In assessing the value of these requests, there are some important considerations that must be made. World labor standards and costs are far below those of the U.S. Our nation's farmers are subjected to far more stringent environmental regulations than those of many of our competitors. Input costs in the U.S. far surpass those of other nations. And energy prices, including farm diesel, are rising dramatically.

So how can a U.S. farmer remain competitive in a global market? He can do it by achieving greater productivity and efficiency, increased yields, and better defenses against diseases. These are the very things that agriculture research funding delivers for U.S. producers—and for U.S. consumers.

If you want to rely on foreign nations for our food in the way we rely on them for our oil, then by all means eliminate these important agriculture research programs. But if you believe, as I do, that maintaining a domestic capability to produce our food is a national security issue, then you ought to support these research programs and fight for their continuation.

The second entity that receives the bulk of these funds is the Agriculture Research Service (ARS) and its stations across rural America. In Idaho, these institutions are conducting vital research into some of our most important crops—sugar, potatoes, small fruits, and aquaculture. I encourage all of my colleagues to visit an ARS station to see firsthand the value of this research. If you do, you will learn that these researchers are doing amazing things with very limited budgets. These projects are usually small in terms of their funding, but the benefits that flow from that research cannot be measured in dollars alone.

Four of the projects below are funded through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). The first program, Potato Cyst Nematode (PCN) Detection and Eradication, provides funding that is critical to saving the potato industry, both in Idaho and across the nation. In August 2006, PCN was discovered in our country for the first time on approximately 1,000 acres in Eastern Idaho. PCN is a major pest of potato crops and is one of the most destructive and difficult pests to control. If left uncontrolled, this pest can result in devastating crop yield losses of up to 80 percent. Without this funding, the pest's significant risk of dispersion could lead to a devastating impact on our nation's agriculture production and exports.

The Greater Yellowstone Brucellosis funding is particularly critical to my home state of Idaho. Idaho recently regained its Brucellosis Class Free Status and these funds are critical to continuing a management plan that will allow Idaho to maintain brucellosis free status.

The Tri-State Predator control funding is hardly a handout to ranchers. The federal government forced wolf reintroduction on Idaho and other western states and it is duty-bound to pay for the deadly and gruesome impacts of this decision.

The funding for the Nez Perce Bio-Control Center will enable the Center to utilize organism-rearing technology to improve mass rearing capabilities for biological control organisms, thus providing long-term management of invasive weeds.

Another project on this list is the Idaho One-Plan. The Idaho One-Plan is a unique collaboration of agencies, industries, and associations dedicated to assisting Idaho farmers and ranchers in their continuing natural resource stewardship responsibilities. The program was developed jointly with state and federal resource agencies, the University of Idaho Cooperative Extension program, the Environmental Protection Agency, and local commodity groups. It's a successful program that has enormous value to not only the Idaho agriculture community and the environment, but to other states that might be interested in a similar collaborative process.

The final project is the Idaho Food Bank Facility Acquisition and Expansion Program. Currently, the Idaho Food Bank, located in Pocatello, Idaho, cannot process all of the donated food and often turns away delivery trucks and donations due to lack of space. An expansion of the food bank would allow more needy families in Eastern Idaho to utilize the food bank's services.

Mr. Chairman, any effort to remove these projects from the bill would not only result in zero savings to taxpayers, it would stop dead these important efforts to enhance and protect our nation's food supply.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them.

(1) \$6,750,000 for APHIS Potato Cyst Nematode Detection and Eradication.

(2) \$854,000 for CSREES Increasing Shelf Life of Agricultural Commodities (WA, OR, ID).

(3) \$96,994 for ARS National Plant Germplasm Program—Aberdeen, ID.

(4) \$628,843 for ARS Aquaculture—Barley Sustainable Feeds—Aberdeen, ID.

(5) \$1,093,728 for ARS Aquaculture Rainbow Trout Research—Aberdeen, ID.

(6) \$99,000 for ARS Aquaculture Sustainable Feeds—Aberdeen, ID.

(7) \$756,000 for CSREES Aquaculture (WA, ID).

(8) \$728,000 for CSREES Barley for Rural Development (MT, ID).

(9) \$900,000 for APHIS Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee.

(10) \$198,000 for NRCS Idaho One-Plan

(11) \$250,000 for APHIS Nez Perce Bio-Control Center.

(12) \$1,300,000 for APHIS Tri-State Predator Control in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

(13) \$558,000 for CSREES Cool Season Legume Research (ID, WA, ND).

(14) \$446,000 for CSREES Grass Seed Cropping for Sustainable Agriculture Research (WA, OR, ID).

(15) 439,000 for CSREES Small Fruit Research (OR, WA, ID).

(16) \$702,592 for ARS Sugarbeet Research—Kimberly, ID.

(17) \$634,000 for CSREES STEEP III Water Quality in the Northwest.

(18) \$6,371,000 for CSREES Wood Utilization (OR, MS, NC, MN, ME, MI, ID, TN, AK, WV).

(19) \$1,482,000 for CSREES Potato Research.

(20) Idaho Food Bank Facility Acquisition and Expansion Program.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend Chairwoman DELAURO for her excellent work on this bill and to address a specific issue that is of growing importance to my constituents.

This March, the light brown apple moth (LBAM), an exotic pest native to Australia, was discovered in California. The moth has been damaging to growers in Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, and San Mateo Counties in my district. In Santa Cruz County, nearly 6,000 moths have now been detected.

This pest can affect a wide variety of plants, flowers, fruits and vegetables, and virtually any crop with a leaf is a potential host.

In order to halt the spread of this pest, USDA has imposed a quarantine in California counties where the moth has been found. Growers in these counties must subject their operations to a visual inspection to demonstrate that their facilities are not infested before they can be cleared to ship produce. For growers within 1.5 miles of a confirmed discovery of the moth, each shipment must be cleared by an inspection.

Canada and Mexico have also placed restrictions on the import of California products.

The quarantine and restrictions are a burden on growers in my district as well as on State and county agriculture officials, but it is a burden they recognize is necessary to prevent the further spread of the light brown apple moth.

What is critical is adequate Federal support and funding for the eradication and inspection effort. The USDA provided \$5 million for this effort at the outset and they are seeking an additional \$12.5 million through the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). The request has been pending with OMB for several weeks now and it needs to be approved.

Even if the funding is released, it may only carry operations through the end of the year. In the coming years, it may take several million dollars more to ensure the job is complete.

This was a relatively late breaking issue to be addressed in this appropriations bill, and I commend Chairwoman DELAURO for recognizing how serious it is and for including report language that calls on the USDA to secure all funds needed from the Commodity Credit Corporation to eradicate the light brown apple moth. In the Senate, \$1 million is included within the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) specifically for this purpose.

As we move forward with this bill and subsequent legislation to deal with agriculture disasters, I look forward to working with the Chairwoman and my colleague, Mr. FARR, to build on what is already in the House and Senate bills in order to ensure that sufficient funding is provided and that it is made available in a timely fashion.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3161

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I

##### AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

##### PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, \$5,505,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$11,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

□ 1600

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I start a period of time in which we're going

to take opportunity to talk about SCHIP.

I strike the last word to speak about the expansion legislation that was pulled from the Energy and Commerce Committee. Reportedly, it will be on the floor later this week, and I would like to highlight the damage it will do, if enacted. Specifically, I'd like to take this opportunity to speak about the very popular Medicare Advantage program.

In Illinois, there are 1,715,548 Medicare beneficiaries. Of these, 145,600, or 8 percent, have selected to receive their health care coverage through a Medicare Advantage plan. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, there are over 6,000 Medicare beneficiaries in my district that are currently enrolled in a Medicare Advantage program.

One of the most troubling things I have heard about the Democrats' bill is actually from Peter Orzag, who is the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. The Director said that under the Democrats' bill, Medicare Advantage enrollment would fall by approximately 8.2 million currently to 5.5 million in 2012, a reduction of 33 percent from current enrollment levels.

Medicare beneficiaries are among this Nation's most vulnerable citizens, and access to comprehensive high-quality affordable health care is imperative to their well-being. As we well know, the population of the United States over age 65 is growing rapidly. The average Medicare beneficiary is likely to have two or more chronic illnesses. Medicare beneficiaries should have choices for their health care coverage similar to those available to individuals under age 65. We should allow them to choose plans that best meet their unique health care needs and to help them coordinate their care, manage their illnesses, and reduce their out-of-pocket costs.

On average, beneficiaries that choose a Medicare Advantage plan in Illinois are receiving over \$60 in extra value each month from their plans. This extra value comes in the form of savings on cost sharing and out-of-pocket protections and on lower part D premiums, or additional benefits like coverage for vision and hearing. Beneficiaries in Medicare Advantage plans report better access to care, more usual sources of care, and more likelihood of seeking care when needed than beneficiaries in traditional fee-for-service operations.

CMS has recently reported that beneficiaries in fee-for-service with no additional sources of coverage have more difficulty getting care and are less likely to have usual source of care than Medicare Advantage enrollees.

All Medicare beneficiaries have access to a Medicare Advantage plan that does not require cost sharing for screenings for breast cancer, cervical cancer and prostate cancer. Recently, CMS has reported that Medicare Advantage enrollees are more likely to

receive preventative services, such as immunizations, mammography, and screenings for colorectal and prostate cancers.

Critics have implied that the Medicare Advantage program is contributing to the solvency problems facing the Medicare trust fund. However, these critics fail to recognize the extra value that Medicare Advantage plans provide that address the real drivers in increasing program costs. Medicare Advantage plans help control the volume and intensity of services used by beneficiaries in Medicare part A and part D by coordinating care, improving health outcomes, and monitoring enrollee usage.

Medicare Advantage generates savings in the part D program by helping to drive down the average premium paid by the government and beneficiaries, and by reducing Federal expenditures for beneficiaries eligible for low-income subsidies.

Critics have further distorted the facts by offering information that claims to suggest a "fairness gap" between Medicare Advantage payments and the other providers. In fact, Medicare Advantage payment rates increase in direct proportion to the Federal Government's estimates of increases in per capita costs in the fee-for-service program.

Some critics suggest that legislators must choose between providing comprehensive health coverage options to Illinois seniors through the Medicare Advantage program or providing coverage to Illinois uninsured children through SCHIP. Both programs play a crucial role in serving vulnerable populations. We should focus on devoting adequate resources to both SCHIP and Medicare Advantage, while working to maintain and strengthen all components of our Nation's health care safety net.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GINGREY: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,050)".

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture by \$50,050, a simple 1 percent; a 1 percent reduction in the expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not aimed necessarily at the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, but it aims to make a simple 1 percent reduction in order to shrink the Federal deficit. Why is that necessary? Well, we should be paying for increased spending by reducing other Federal spending, that's the 1 percent I'm calling for, rather than raising taxes or putting the burden on our Medicare seniors, as we do



in this proposed SCHIP reauthorization and expansion, Mr. Chairman.

And as we all know, the Democratic majority, the Energy and Commerce Committee bill, which will be combined with the bill out of the Ways and Means Committee we will be dealing with in the next day or two on this floor, calls for a \$50 billion increase over the next 5 years. Now, that's on top of the base program which, in the aggregate, was a \$25 billion program over the last 5 years. We're not going to increase that by 10 percent, by 20 percent, by 50 percent, or even by 100 percent. We're increasing it even more than that, going from \$25 billion, Mr. Chairman, to \$75 billion.

So, that's why I'm standing before the body today and saying, look, this is a small cut; this is a little bit of money. But a little bit of money here and a little bit of money there, I've got lots of amendments where we ought to cut other programs here 1 percent to try to pay for some of these things that we are doing that violate your own rules, your own PAYGO rules.

Mr. Chairman, I will say this; this new SCHIP program, everything's got to have an acronym, doesn't it? And it sells well if it has a catchy little acronym. And the Democratic majority is calling this one, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee came up with a nice, little cutesy acronym for this mass expansion called the CHAMP Act, Children's Health and Medicare Protection Act.

Mr. Chairman, I've got an acronym for this bill which fits it a lot better, and that acronym is the "CHUMP Act." That's what it is, the CHUMP Act, the Children's Health Unfunding Medicare Protection Act. Because, Mr. Chairman, what this bill calls for is to totally wreck, totally destroy Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage is that part of the Medicare program where some 8 million out of 41, 42 million seniors have chosen that health care delivery model because they know they get an opportunity for preventative health care, they get an opportunity to have a nurse practitioner, a physician assistant, or maybe even the doctor him- or herself looking at their health care needs and not just providing, as in traditional Medicare, episodic care where there is no coordination. And a lot of times patients, particularly our seniors with multiple systems diseases, will come home from one doctor with a handful of prescriptions and the next week they're going to another doctor with a handful of prescriptions.

The Medicare Advantage program was designed to help prevent that, to put an emphasis on coordination, on connecting the dots so that we wouldn't duplicate services, or in some instances, Mr. Chairman, even provide a level of care or prescription that could be detrimental to the patient, that could be counterproductive.

So, this is why I feel that my amendment, this small amendment to cut by 1 percent the Office of the Secretary of

Agriculture, is a move in the right direction to say, look, don't do this massive expansion of the SCHIP program; reauthorize it. We all want to reauthorize it. In fact, I think maybe what the President called for in his budget was a little bit on the low side. Maybe increasing it \$1 billion a year is not quite enough, if indeed, Mr. Chairman, there are 6 million youngsters who are needy and do not have health insurance in this country.

So, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I think my colleague from Georgia maybe doesn't understand what bill is on the floor today. This is the Agriculture appropriations bill. There will be an opportunity to discuss SCHIP, and you can continue to do that, but let me just comment about your Agriculture appropriations amendment.

The House bill includes funding for central administration offices to fund current staff. The only increase is for pay costs. And I might just tell you that for all of the staff offices in central administration, that the work that was done by the committee literally cut these offices by about 16 percent. So it was just pay and benefits.

However, you should know I feel the obligation to mention these things to you, that any cuts in these offices will result in the reduction of headquarters staff, not the field staff, because that's the personnel that deals directly on a one-to-one basis with our farmers and with our ranchers so that they can access the system and be able to do what they need to do.

Now, I'm going to give the gentleman an opportunity to withdraw his amendment, because I am prepared to accept your amendment, and I'm happy to accept your amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the Chair seeks to accept the amendment, then that ends the debate; correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question on the amendment at the conclusion of the debate on the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. The debate is over then; correct?

Ms. DELAURO. We have accepted the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy that the Chair is accepting this amendment, but I would like to speak

on it as an opportunity to speak about cutting government spending.

Though it's just \$50,500, that's far more than the median income in my district. I want the American taxpayers to know that this is an important step, and it's good that they're accepting a limitation on the rapid increase in spending within this legislation.

There are a lot of good points that we have to consider here. We have to consider the totality of government spending when we're debating here on the House floor. The government spending for this fiscal year is over \$2.7 trillion. To put that into perspective, Mr. Chairman, that is larger than all the economies of the world, except for two. It is far larger than even the Chinese economy, which is about \$1.9 trillion.

The reason why I bring this up is that when we're discussing each of these appropriations bills, we tend to focus on small parts of the appropriations process. We tend to focus on an amendment here, an amendment there, maybe increasing funding here and there and increasing funding in a particular appropriations bill. But we have to talk about what's that doing to the whole of the budget. And if we spend money here in the Department of Agriculture, we may not have that money to fund this SCHIP proposal that the Democrats are bringing to the floor at the end of this week.

Now, to talk about that bill, what they're going to do is not simply cut government spending elsewhere in the budget, elsewhere in the government, reforming programs, eliminating programs that are ineffective and no longer cost-effective for the American taxpayers, but what they do is they go out and find new revenue and raise taxes under this SCHIP proposal.

The Agriculture bill we have here today increases government spending, thereby forcing this new Democrat majority to go out and raise taxes for their new programs. And, Mr. Chairman, they've proposed a lot of new programs, this new Democrat majority, and what we have to do is focus on making sure we balance the budget. Now, balancing the budget, to me, as a fiscal conservative, does not mean going out and getting new revenue.

□ 1615

It means doing things, sensible things, such as the Congressman from Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, my good friend and colleague, is doing here. It cuts 1 percent out of the administrative budget of the Department of Agriculture, just 1 percent.

I have an amendment that I would like to perfect. If 1 percent was acceptable to the Chair, I would like to see if maybe 2 percent would be acceptable and see where we can actually draw the line in cutting government spending, where the breaking point is in this House of Representatives. To that end, I think it is important that we have a discussion on what that proper number is.

I know my colleague from Georgia may have another amendment similar to this next up, I hope, at which point I would like to see if we can actually go a little bit further in cutting government spending. Let's talk about not just the Agriculture appropriations bill, which is the key focus of today, but also the long-term consequences of our just having a narrow, myopic focus on the current bill on the floor. Let's talk about the totality of government spending, ways that we can reform the government, limit the government, and actually get back to what is sensible.

We have a big debate going on right now about the war in Iraq. We have a big debate going on about children's health care. We have a big debate about whether or not the farm bill that we passed last week was the right thing to do and whether or not you should actually have a massive tax increase in order to implement the new programs within that formula. Many of us agree that that wasn't the right thing to do, but, unfortunately, the majority in the House did vote for that massive tax increase.

It is important that we have a discussion on health care and agriculture and the long-term consequences of these issues going forward. Certainly, the bill today and the chairman's willingness to accept a 1 percent cut in the administrative budget is a step in the right direction. We can be thankful for that.

I hope, as we go on in the debate, the Chair will be willing to accept other amendments that limit the rapid increase of funds going to the Department of Agriculture and we can actually rightsize the government. There are many on this side of the aisle who want to cut the size and scope of government. I know that the chairwoman has been willing to examine programs and reform those programs. I hope that she will be willing to accept many of the amendments we have here today.

I also know my colleague from Georgia has a number of amendments like this. It is important that we discuss the long-term consequences of our failure to limit the growth of government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for Members on both sides of the aisle to understand what is going to transpire here. This is a filibuster masquerading as an amendment. This amendment cuts \$50,000, a tiny, tiny symbolic sum, from the administrative account in question. But, as I see it, this is not a real amendment.

What it means is that it simply affords those who offer it, under the guise of talking about spending, to really engage in delay and delay and delay. Because their goal, if they can, is to not have the House finish its appropriations business. Their goal, also,

if they can, is to delay the SCHIP bill from coming to the floor and finally being passed by the House.

So after we have seen this administration and their allies in this House borrow \$1.2 trillion to pay for tax cuts and after we have seen them borrow another \$600 billion to finance that misbegotten war in Iraq, now they pretend that they are contributing to the public good by offering to cut spending by \$50,000; not \$50 billion, but \$50,000.

This is, in plain language, a filibuster. It is the first of many amendments that are being offered by people who are so opposed to the SCHIP proposition, which will be before us tomorrow, that they would prefer to defend \$50 billion in tax cuts for people making \$1 million a year than they would to see 5 million more kids covered by health insurance in this country. That is really what is afoot here.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself only mildly amused, because the subject really is serious. I find myself only mildly amused by the fact that, 3 days ago, we had the President announce another large, massive increase in foreign aid which he wants us to provide yet this year.

We also now increasingly are coming to understand that the President will be asking for an extension of the surge in Iraq, which will require him to ask the Congress to spend an extra \$25 billion to \$30 billion above and beyond \$140 billion he is planning to ask for in the supplemental already for this year for Iraq. So, yet, we are here mired today in this let's-pretend Potemkin debate over \$50,000.

We don't, on this side of the aisle, intend to get bogged down; at least, we don't intend to contribute to the bogging down. So we will let them drone on, drone on and drone on with their Lilliputian amendments.

Meanwhile, we recognize what is happening: If the other side wants to delay the people's business for a while, all that means is that, in the end, our colleagues won't be going home on Friday, they won't be going home on Saturday, and we will still be having Sunday dinner together.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the chairman, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his legislation to make a 1 percent reduction. We have got to start taking these first steps.

Year after year, I feel there is a group of us that come down here talking about how we slow the growth of government, talking about how we make reductions in what the government spends and talking about the necessity to begin with those little, tiny savings, ¼ percent, ½ percent, a solid percent, that will yield a savings. We are talking about \$5.5 million. I find it

just amazing that we can't even find \$50,000 in there. We can't agree to make that kind of reduction. There are ways to do this. That is something government should be doing.

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned the SCHIP program. Indeed, in our Committee on Energy and Commerce, we have been quite disheartened that the SCHIP bill that he mentioned is not going through regular order. We didn't have a committee hearing in our Health Subcommittee. We would have welcomed that.

There is nobody against health care for low-income children. What we have great concerns about is all the other stuff, all the pay-fors that are in this bill, all the expansion of policy, taking a block grant, moving it to an entitlement. It brings us back to the initial question with the gentleman's bill on this appropriations bill of making a 1 percent reduction. There has to be a way to yield a savings that will pay for some of these things, because we can't take it out of Medicare Advantage.

The SCHIP legislation that the gentleman mentioned would make an incredible reduction to Medicare Advantage. My goodness, we would see \$193 billion in reductions to our Medicare Advantage program over a 10-year period of time, which would be \$15.3 billion in cuts to Medicare Part A for seniors. This would include skilled nursing facilities, rehab facilities, and long-term care hospitals. That would be one of the pay-fors in the SCHIP bill that the gentleman referenced.

That is why the gentleman from Georgia has a great amendment that says, let's get going. In title 1, page 1 of this bill, let's start finding a way to make some reductions. \$9.6 billion in cuts to Medicare Part D for seniors is in that bill, that SCHIP bill that didn't go through subcommittee, didn't get a complete markup in committee. It is going to be moved to the floor.

So, there, again, the gentleman from Wisconsin's points on this bill is the reason we have this amendment to title 1, section 1 of this bill, to make that reduction in the Secretary's spending, \$5.5 million. Certainly, we can find \$50,000. \$3.6 billion would be cut out of end-stage renal disease in that bill. There has to be a way to start making reductions so that you're paying for the government that you are trying to spend, the money you are trying to spend, the government you are putting out there. There has got to be a way to pay for this. Unfortunately, that is not something that we are seeing considered.

Mr. Chairman, \$50,000 may not be much to the Secretary, but it is a lot to my constituents in Tennessee and especially those that are on Medicare Advantage.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear. The gentlewoman may not be aware of it, but we

have accepted this amendment. The majority has accepted Mr. GINGREY's first amendment for \$50,000. The gentlewoman said that \$50,000 is very important to her constituents. The majority has heard it. Therefore, we accept the amendment. I think we can dispose of this amendment and move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I would just say we have accepted the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, as the Chair of the committee pointed out, this is a filibuster to talk about another issue. Now, you can continue to do that. The sooner you stop filibustering, the sooner we can move on. We have accepted the amendment. But that is up to you.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time.

The gentlewoman's constituents should be very proud that we have accepted the amendment. The \$50,000 that

is so important to her constituents, to all Americans, has been accepted. We can dispose of this and move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for accepting the amendment. It is a commonsense way to begin this process that lacks a lot of common sense.

I wish to commend my colleague from Georgia for beginning the process of fiscal responsibility on this next appropriations bill. I would point out, however, that this bill spends \$1.04 billion more than last year, an increase of 5.9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there aren't many folks across this Nation who got a 5.9 percent increase in their budget this year. So, I think that the amendment of my colleague from Georgia is an appropriate effort to try to begin the process of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here supporting this amendment because as we attempt, and thank goodness we have the support of the majority on this small attempt, to begin to decrease bureaucracy, we are faced with a significant and huge increase in bureaucracy coming later this week.

I say that because my friend, the chairman of the committee, says, well, our goal here is to not finish the business. No, Mr. Chairman, our goal is to bring focus to an issue and to a bill that will not be allowed to get the focus that this bill gets. Because, as you know, Mr. Chairman, the rules of the House that will bring bills to the floor later this week will be of such a nature that Members of the House won't be able to come to the floor and talk about it. They won't be able to come to the floor and offer amendments in an open and deliberative process. They won't be able to exercise the right that they felt, and certainly their constituents felt, they would be given by being elected to this august body.

#### **NOTICE**

***Incomplete record of House proceedings.***

***Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***